

# EXTRACTION & CONTROL

## STUDIES IN HONOR OF MATTHEW W. STOLPER

*edited by*

Michael Kozuh

Wouter F. M. Henkelman

Charles E. Jones

*and*

Christopher Woods

*Funded by the Generosity of the Yelda Family*

STUDIES IN ANCIENT ORIENTAL CIVILIZATION • NUMBER 68  
THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
CHICAGO • ILLINOIS

Library of Congress Control Number: 2013956374

ISBN-10: 1-61491-001-4

ISBN-13: 978-1-61491-001-5

ISSN: 0081-7554

*The Oriental Institute, Chicago*

© 2014 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved.

Published 2014. Printed in the United States of America.

Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations 68

*Leslie Schramer and Thomas G. Urban*

*Series Editors' Acknowledgments*

Rebecca Cain, Dennis Campbell, and Brian Keenan assisted in the production of this volume.

*Cover Illustration*

Matthew W. Stolper gazing at the colossal bull head (OIM A24065, Persepolis, Achaemenid) in the Robert and Deborah Aliber Persian Gallery of the Oriental Institute Museum

*Printed by McNaughton & Gunn, Saline, Michigan*

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Services — Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

# Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations . . . . .	vii
Matthew W. Stolper	
<i>Christopher Woods, Wouter F. M. Henkelman, Charles E. Jones, and Michael Kozuh . . . . .</i>	viii
Bibliography of Publications of Matthew W. Stolper	
<i>Charles E. Jones, The Pennsylvania State University, University of Chicago . . . . .</i>	x
1. Persepolis Fortification Aramaic Tablet Seal 0002 and the Keeping of Horses	
<i>Annalisa Azzoni, Vanderbilt University, and Elspeth R. M. Dusingher, University of Colorado at Boulder. . . . .</i>	1
2. An Episode in the Reign of the Babylonian Pretender Nebuchadnezzar IV	
<i>Paul-Alain Beaulieu, University of Toronto. . . . .</i>	17
3. Achaemenid Estate(s) Near Pasargadae?	
<i>Rémy Bouchardat, CNRS – University of Lyon . . . . .</i>	27
4. Les tablettes de bois du Grand roi (Note sur les communications officielles dans un royaume itinérant)	
<i>Pierre Briant, Collège de France . . . . .</i>	37
5. Royal Women in Elamite Art	
<i>Elizabeth Carter, University of California, Los Angeles . . . . .</i>	41
6. Iddin-Nabû sēpir ša gardu	
<i>Walter Farber, University of Chicago . . . . .</i>	63
7. The Royal-Name Seals of Darius I	
<i>Mark B. Garrison, Trinity University . . . . .</i>	67
8. De vie à trépas	
<i>Françoise Grillot-Susini, CNRS – Paris . . . . .</i>	105
9. The Estates of Šamaš on the Ḫābūr	
<i>Michael Jursa and Klaus Wagensonner, University of Vienna. . . . .</i>	109
10. Elamite and Akkadian Inscribed Bricks from Bard-e Karezgar (Khuzistan, Iran)	
<i>Michael Kozuh, Auburn University. . . . .</i>	131
11. Reassessing the Reign of Xerxes in the Light of New Evidence	
<i>Amélie Kuhrt, University College London . . . . .</i>	163
12. Cultural Exchange at Kültepe	
<i>Mogens Trolle Larsen, University of Copenhagen, and Agnete Wisti Lassen, Yale University . . . . .</i>	171
13. The Curricular Context of an Akkadian Prayer from Old Babylonian Ur (UET 6 402)	
<i>Jacob Lauinger, Johns Hopkins University . . . . .</i>	189
14. Myth, History, Cosmology, and Hydraulics in Achaemenid Iran	
<i>Bruce Lincoln, University of Chicago . . . . .</i>	197
15. Biography of a Sentence: Assurbanipal, Nabonidus, and Cyrus	
<i>Piotr Michalowski, University of Michigan . . . . .</i>	203
16. Periodicities and Period Relations in Babylonian Celestial Sciences	
<i>Francesca Rochberg, University of California, Berkeley . . . . .</i>	211
17. On Persons in the Old Babylonian Law Collections: The Case of <i>mār awilim</i> in Bodily Injury Provisions	
<i>Martha T. Roth, University of Chicago . . . . .</i>	219
18. Gilgamesh and the <i>ius primae noctis</i>	
<i>Gonzalo Rubio, Pennsylvania State University . . . . .</i>	229
19. Cyrus the Great, Exiles, and Foreign Gods: A Comparison of Assyrian and Persian Policies on Subject Nations	
<i>R. J. van der Spek, VU University Amsterdam. . . . .</i>	233
20. Persians on the Euphrates? Material Culture and Identity in Two Achaemenid Burials from Hacinebi, Southeast Turkey	
<i>Gil J. Stein, The Oriental Institute, University of Chicago . . . . .</i>	265
21. On the Dynasty of Šimaški: Twenty Years (or so) After	
<i>Piotr Steinkeller, Harvard University . . . . .</i>	287

22. Some Thoughts on the <i>ustarbaru</i> <i>Jan Tavernier, Université catholique de Louvain</i> . . . . .	297
23. A Statue of Darius in the Temple of Sippar <i>Caroline Waerzeggers, VU University Amsterdam</i> . . . . .	323
24. Earth, Water, and Friendship with the King: Argos and Persia in the Mid-fifth Century <i>Matthew W. Waters, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire</i> . . . . .	331
25. Freedom and Dependency: Neo-Babylonian Manumission Documents with Oblation and Service Obligation <i>Cornelia Wunsch, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, and F. Rachel Magdalene, Leipzig University</i> . . . .	337
26. From Lower Land to Cappadocia <i>Ilya Yakubovich, University of Chicago</i> . . . . .	347

## Some Thoughts on the *ustarbaru*

Jan Tavernier, Université catholique de Louvain\*

One of the most conspicuous officials of fifth-century Nippur is the *ustarbaru*. Although this appellative is predominantly attested in texts belonging to the Murašû archive, there are various other texts from the Achaemenid period mentioning this official. The word has been variously translated as “Steuerinspektor,”<sup>1</sup> “Abgabe-Inspektor,”<sup>2</sup> “trésorier,”<sup>3</sup> and “chambellan, chamberlain.”<sup>4</sup>

In this study, which stems from a presentation I gave in a course on the Murašûs taught by Professor Stolper, all known *ustarbarus* are discussed, including both those attested in Babylonian as well as those attested in Elamite (and Old Persian) texts. The etymology and linguistic history of the expression *ustarbaru* is discussed along with the role of these people in the source material. The later sections of this article deal with possible insignia of *ustarbarus* and situate them in a wider Achaemenid context.

### 1. The Babylonian Evidence

#### 1.1. Prosopographical Data<sup>5</sup>

##### 1.1.1. Bagadata<sup>6</sup> / Bēl-iddin (seal no. 204<sup>7</sup>)

This person, bearing an Iranian name and having a Babylonian patronymic, is attested in a litigation (BE 10 9). He accuses Enlil-šum-iddin, the son of Murašû, and his cohort with trespassing. Enlil-šum-iddin denies and buys off Bagadata from further claims. The text is dated to 18/I/1 Darius II (= 28 Apr 423) and is sealed by Bagadata. In the same text his agents (*mār bīti* “member of the household”), commissioned agents (*ālik našparti*),<sup>8</sup> and servants (*ardu*) are mentioned.

\* This research has been funded by the Interuniversity Attraction Poles Programme initiated by the Belgian Science Policy Office (IAP 7/14: “Greater Mesopotamia: Reconstruction of Its Environment and History”).

<sup>1</sup> Josef Kohler and Arthur Ungnad, *Hundert ausgewählte Rechtsurkunden aus der Spätzeit des babylonischen Schrifttums von Xerxes bis Mithridates II. (485–93 v. Chr.)* (Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1911), p. 34.

<sup>2</sup> Kohler and Ungnad, *Hundert ausgewählte Rechtsurkunden*, p. 51; Julius Augapfel, *Babylonische Rechtsurkunden aus der Regierungszeit Artaxerxes I. und Darius II.*, Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Denkschriften 59/3 (Vienna: Hölder, 1917), p. 102.

<sup>3</sup> Francis Joannès, “Textes babyloniens de Suse d’époque achéménide,” in *Contribution à l’histoire de l’Iran: Mélanges offertes à Jean Perrot*, edited by François Vallat (Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les civilisations, 1990), pp. 173–80.

<sup>4</sup> Francis Joannès and André Lemaire, “Contrats babyloniens d’époque achéménide du Bît-Abî Râm avec une épigraphe araméenne,” *Revue d’Assyriologie et d’archéologie orientale* 90 (1996): 49; Wouter F. M. Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial: The Šumar of Cambyse and Hystaspes,” in *A Persian Perspective: Essays in Memory of Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg*, edited by Wouter F. M. Henkelman and Amélie Kuhrt, *Achaemenid History* 13 (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2003), p. 120; Michael Jursa and Matthew W. Stolper, “From the Tattannu Archive Fragment,” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 97 (2007): 254.

<sup>5</sup> See also Wilhelm Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen in der keilschriftlichen Überlieferung*, *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 25/5 (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1940), pp. 83–89.

<sup>6</sup> \*Bagadāta- “given by Baga” (Ferdinand Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch* [Marburg: Elwert, 1895], p. 57; Walther Hinz, *Altiranisches Sprachgut der Nebenüberlieferungen*, *Göttinger Orientforschungen* 3/3 [Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1975], pp. 54–55; Muhammad A. Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, *Columbia Lectures on Iranian Studies* 6 [Costa Mesa: Mazda, 1992], p. 50; Jan Tavernier, *Iranica in the Achaemenid Period (ca. 550–330 B.C.): Lexicon of Old Iranian Proper Names and Loanwords, Attested in Non-Iranian Texts*, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 158 [Leuven: Peeters, 2007], pp. 132–33 no. 4.2.246).

<sup>7</sup> The seal and ring numbers given here are the ones used in Linda Beth Bregstein, “Seal Use in Fifth Century B.C. Nippur, Iraq: A Study of Seal Selection and Sealing Practices in the Murašû Archive” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1993; Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 2000).

<sup>8</sup> The *ālik našparti* are not attested very often and always appear in a kind of fixed expression: “agents, commissioned agent(s) and servants” (LÚ.DUMU.MEŠ É.MEŠ, *a-lik na-āš-par-ti*, LÚ.ARAD.MEŠ; BE 9 69; BE 10 9) or “agents, servants, and commissioned agent(s)” (IMT 105; PBS 2/1 137). One time the servants are not included (PBS 2/1 140). The expression seems to sum up all subordinates of a particular person, apparently in three categories. Guillaume Cardascia, *Les archives des Murašû: une famille d’hommes d’affaires babyloniens à l’époque perse (455–403 av. J.-C.)* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1951), p. 11, believes the expression reflects some hierarchy, but the different order in which the categories are listed casts doubts on this hypothesis.

1.1.2. *Bagamihi*<sup>9</sup>

*Bagamihi* also renders an Iranian name. Its bearer was an *ustarbaru*, whose agent Bēl-nādin / Nabû-ittannu receives rations and rent for land from Enlil-šum-iddin (BE 9 50; dated 20/VIII/36 Artaxerxes I = 29 Nov 429). Bēl-nādin (seal no. 47) sealed the document.

1.1.3. *Bagapata*<sup>10</sup>

Hitherto this name (spelled <sup>md</sup>Bag-<sup>3</sup>-a-pa-a-tu<sub>4</sub>) was read <sup>md</sup>Hu-<sup>3</sup>-a-pa-a-tu<sub>4</sub> and analyzed as a rendering of Iranian \*Xvapati-.<sup>11</sup> It has, however, been pointed out that the reading <sup>md</sup>Bag-<sup>3</sup>-a-pa-a-tu<sub>4</sub>, rendering \*Bagapāta-, is more plausible.<sup>12</sup>

Bagapata occurs in a receipt of payments made by his bailiff (WZKM 97 278: 4, 6–7).<sup>13</sup> The text is drafted on 29/V/19 Artaxerxes II (= 7 Sep 386).

1.1.4. *Bagazuštu* / *Bagadata*<sup>14</sup>

*Bagazuštu* / *Bagadata* the *ustarbaru* is mentioned in the unpublished and undated text VAT 15608, drafted in Babylon, and possibly also in PBS 2/1 192 (422 B.C.) as a witness.<sup>15</sup> Both he and his father have Iranian names. Moreover, this *Bagazuštu* provides an interesting prosopographical link between the Murašû and the Kasr archives.

1.1.5. *Bagazuštu* / *Marḥarpu*

This man, explicitly called an Egyptian (<sup>lú</sup>Mi-šir-a-a), occurs in a text (RA 90 48–49 no. 6) dated to the reign of Darius I (18/VIII/26 = 17 Nov 496). He leases out a plot of land to Zababa-šar-ušur, who is the major-domo of the crown prince's

People called *ālik našparti* are only attested in the Murašû archive, although connections between *alāku* and *našpartu* are regularly attested in Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian texts. The officials are always directly related to a personal name, in all but one case to members of the Murašû family. The exception is the *ustarbaru* Bagadata (herein § 1.1.1), who also disposes of this type of agents. Since *ālik našparti* is not a plural form one could believe there was only one *ālik našparti* involved. Nevertheless it is always situated between plural forms. In addition, the form has only descriptive value; never is there an individual *ālik našparti* attested (Matthew W. Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire: The Murašû Archive, the Murašû Firm, and Persian Rule in Babylonia*, Publications de l'Institut historique et archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul 54 [Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1985], p. 20).

The precise task and/or responsibilities of the *ālik našpartu* are not clear. Basically, it may have two meanings, "who is in the service of" or "who conducts business." This dichotomy has created various translations: "messenger" (Hermann V. Hilprecht and Albert T. Clay, *Business Documents of Murashû Sons of Nippur, Dated in the Reign of Artaxerxes I (464–424 B.C.)*, The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, Series A: Cuneiform Texts 9 [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Department of Archaeology and Palaeontology, 1898], p. 32; Albert T. Clay, *Business Documents of Murashû Sons of Nippur, Dated in the Reign of Darius II (424–404 B.C.)*, The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, Series A: Cuneiform Texts 10 [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Department of Archaeology and Palaeontology, 1904], p. 31), "Leib-eigene" (Kohler and Ungnad, *Hundert ausgewählte Rechtsurkunden*, p. 46), "Beauftragter" (Augapfel, *Babylonische Rechtsurkunden*, p. 74), "Dienstbote" (Mariano San Nicolò and Arthur Ungnad, *Neubabylonische Rechts- und Verwaltungskunde*, Vol. 1: *Rechts- und Wirtschafts-urkunden der Berliner Museen aus vorhellenistischer Zeit* [Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1929], p. 184 no. 150 n. 8), "Geschäftsführer" (AHw. s.v. *našpartu*), "agent" (CAD s.v. *ālik našparti*; Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire*, p. 20), "commissioned agent" (Veysel Donbaz and Matthew W. Stolper, *Istanbul Murašû Texts*, Publications de l'Institut historique et archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul 79 [Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul, 1997], p. 153). The present author is inclined not to overestimate the status of the *ālik našparti*. The combination of the verb *alāku* and *našpartu* may refer to both service obligations and business commissions (see CAD s.v. *našpartu* A mng. 3a 1'–2', where *ālik našparti* is believed to refer to

business commissions). Nevertheless, the first meaning (service obligations) occurs much more frequently and is always attached to a personal name, as is *ālik našparti*.

<sup>9</sup> \*Bagamihra- "Baga's treaty" (Wilhelm Eilers, "Eine mittelpersische Wortform aus frühachämenidischer Zeit?" *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 90 [1936]: note on p. 175; Hinz, *Altiranisches Sprachgut*, p. 57; Ran Zadok, "Iranians and Individuals Bearing Iranian Names in Achaemenian Babylonia," *Israel Oriental Studies* 7 [1977]: 101; Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, p. 55; Tavernier, *Iranica*, p. 136 no. 4.2.264).

<sup>10</sup> \*Bagapāta- "protected by Baga" (Hinz, *Altiranisches Sprachgut*, p. 58; Zadok, "Iranians and Individuals," p. 94 and n. 29; Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, p. 59; Tavernier, *Iranica*, pp. 137–38 no. 4.2.275).

<sup>11</sup> Ran Zadok, "Foreigners and Foreign Linguistic Material in Mesopotamia and Egypt," in *Immigration and Emigration within the Ancient Near East: Festschrift E. Lipiński*, edited by Karel van Lerberghe and Antoon Schoors, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 65 (Leuven: Peeters, 1995), p. 442; idem, "Some Iranian Anthroponyms and Toponyms," *Nouvelles assyriologiques brèves et utilitaires* 1997/7: no. 5.

<sup>12</sup> Jan Tavernier, "A Note on <sup>ld</sup>Hu-<sup>3</sup>-a-pa-a-tu<sub>4</sub> (HSM 8414)," *Nouvelles assyriologiques brèves et utilitaires* 2004/3. As Jursa and Stolper have pointed out, some support for the strange spelling of the name is presented by the equally odd spelling of Zabādā as "Za-ba-ad-a in the same text (Jursa and Stolper, "Tattannu Archive Fragment," p. 253).

<sup>13</sup> See Matthew W. Stolper, *Late Achaemenid, Early Macedonian and Early Seleucid Records of Deposit and Related Texts*, *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli*, Supplemento 77 (Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1993), p. 10.

<sup>14</sup> \*Bagazušta- "loved by Baga" (Hilprecht and Clay, *Business Documents of Murashû*, p. 51; Wilhelm Eilers, "Neue aramäische Urkunden aus Ägypten," *Archiv für Orientforschung* 17 [1954–1956]: 332; Hinz, *Altiranisches Sprachgut*, p. 61; Zadok, "Iranians and Individuals," p. 96 and n. 51; Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, p. 62; Tavernier, *Iranica*, p. 144 no. 4.2.310).

<sup>15</sup> Matthew W. Stolper, "Achaemenid Legal Texts from the Kasr: Interim Observations," in *Babylon: Focus mesopotamischer Geschichte, Wiege früherer Gelehrsamkeit, Mythos in der Moderne*, edited by Johannes Renger, *Colloquien der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 2 (Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag, 1999), p. 375 and n. 31.

estate.<sup>16</sup> The *ustarbaru* again has an Iranian name, while his father has an Egyptian one.<sup>17</sup> Most likely the son had an Egyptian name too, but took an Iranian name or changed his Egyptian name into an Iranian one in order to have more opportunities for an administrative career. His high position is also expressed by the title *ša rēš šarri* “royal commissioner.”

According to Joannès and Lemaire<sup>18</sup> the same person may be mentioned among other Persian officials in Amherst 258 (lines 4 or 12), the date of which, however, is an issue of debate.<sup>19</sup> The text itself is a ration list for high-ranked persons, some of them with Persian names (e.g., Uštana / Ostanes, satrap of Babylonia and Across-the-River).

#### 1.1.6. *Bēl-bullissu* / *Damamiasta* (seal no. 633)

In BE 9 102 (16/VII/41 Artaxerxes I = 30 Oct 424) *Bēl-bullissu* leases a field to Enlil-šum-iddin. He has a Babylonian name, while his father has probably, but not certainly, an Iranian one.<sup>20</sup> He is also mentioned as *šaknu ša Banaikānu* “foreman of the Banaikānu.”

#### 1.1.7. *Bēl-ētir* / *Šara-ilī* (seal no. 153)

An *ustarbaru* with a Babylonian name and a West Semitic patronymic.<sup>21</sup> He is attested as first and sealing witness in BE 9 102.

#### 1.1.8. *Bēl-ibukaš*

Two agents (Nabû-nadin and Aššur-aḥ-iddin) of *Bēl-ibukaš* serve as witnesses in BE 9 1 (dated to 28/VII/1 Arta II = 1 Nov 404). Again this official has a Babylonian name.

Perhaps *Bēl-ibukaš* occurs also in ROMCT 2 35, a slave sale not belonging to the Murašû archive. In this text *Bēl-ibukaš* / *Nidintu-Bēl* is mentioned before the witnesses in a group of three judges.

If it is indeed him, then ROMCT 2 35 is dated to 1/IX/10 Artaxerxes II (= 24 Nov 395). If not, the text can also be dated to 1/IX/10 in the reign of Artaxerxes I (= 27 Nov 455). There are no strong prosopographical ties with the Murašû archive except for the name *Bēl-ab-ušur* / *Bēl-bullissu* (mentioned also in PBS 2/1 113 and 195) and the text was not drafted in Nippur itself, but in Ḥuṣ-Šagībi, a place only known through this text. If *Bēl-ibukaš* the *ustarbaru* is the same person as *Bēl-ibukaš* the judge then ROMCT 2 35 must be dated to Artaxerxes II and the location of Ḥuṣ-Šagībi is not far from Nippur.<sup>22</sup> This remains hypothetical.

#### 1.1.9. *Bēl-īdiš* / *Nabû-bullissu*

Unfortunately, the only text where this *ustarbaru* occurs (PBS 2/1 96) is badly damaged. Its date is 12/XII/4 Darius II (= 9 Mar 419). In the text Ḥašdaya, an associate of *Bēl-īdiš*, leases land, among which is a bow fief of *Bēl-īdiš*, to Rīmūt-Ninurta, member of the Murašû family.

#### 1.1.10. *Bēl-ittannu* / *Bēl-uballiṭ* (seal no. 409)

First of all, this *ustarbaru* (with a Babylonian name and patronymic) is member of a panel that has to decide in a litigation between Šiṭā', a servant of Prince Aršam, and Enlil-šum-iddin (IMT 105).

<sup>16</sup> Joannès and Lemaire, “Contrats babyloniens,” pp. 54–56.

<sup>17</sup> This name can be analyzed in various ways. The first part, represented by Babylonian *mar*°, is in all likelihood Egyptian *mr* “loved by,” suggesting that the second part of the name is a divine name. Possibilities for Babylonian *-harpu* then are (1) *Ḥrp*, a metathesis of *Ḥpr*, i.e., Khepri, the Egyptian beetle god; (2) *Ḥrp* “the leading” or an abbreviation of a divine name containing this element (see Christian Leitz et al., *Lexikon der ägyptischen Götter und Götterbezeichnungen*, Vol. 4: *nbt-h*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 113 [Leuven: Peeters, 2002], pp. 948–49); and (3) *Ḥrpw* or an abbreviation of a name containing this element, which is related to the previous possibility (see Christian Leitz et al., *Lexikon der ägyptischen Götter und Götterbezeichnungen*, Vol. 5: *h-h*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 114 [Leuven: Peeters, 2002], p. 950).

<sup>18</sup> Joannès and Lemaire, “Contrats babyloniens,” p. 56 n. 28.

<sup>19</sup> Theophilus G. Pinches, “Notes Upon a Small Collection of Tablets from the Birs Nimroud Belonging to Lord Amherst of Hackney,” in *Verhandlungen des XIII. Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses, Hamburg, September 1902* (Leiden: Brill, 1904), p. 269, dated the tablet

to year 30 of Darius I (492/91), but Arthur Ungnad, “Neubabylonische Privaturkunden aus der Sammlung Amherst,” *Archiv für Orientalforschung* 19 (1960), p. 81, considered this incorrect. According to him the tablet was written around 485, certainly not later than 484/483. Zadok, “Iranians and Individuals,” p. 138, believes that the text must be situated between 520 and 503/02. Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, p. 28, prefers the end of the first quarter of the fifth century, but elsewhere (ibid., pp. 35, 41, and 46) he accepts Ungnad’s date. Pierre Briant, *Histoire de l’empire perse: de Cyrus à Alexandre*, Achaemenid History 10 (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1996), p. 526, remains cautious when he proposes the beginning of the fifth century as a possible date.

<sup>20</sup> Tavernier, *Iranica*, p. 514 no. 5.4.2.18.

<sup>21</sup> Ran Zadok, *On West Semites in Babylonia during the Chaldean and Achaemenian Periods: An Onomastic Study* (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1977), p. 87; Bregstein, “Seal Use,” p. 549.

<sup>22</sup> Ran Zadok, *Geographical Names According to New- and Late-Babylonian Texts*, Répertoire géographique des textes cunéiformes 8 (Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert, 1985), p. 177.

Secondly, he occurs as a witness four times with his title and patronymic in the following texts: BE 10 80; PBS 2/1 63, 76, and 224.

Finally, there are six texts where Bēl-ittannu, the *ustarbaru*, is mentioned without a patronymic: EE 52; PBS 2/1 104, 126, 207; RA 86 75; and TuM 2/3 204. As there is also an *ustarbaru* attested with the same name but a different patronymic (Naʿesī; no. 1.1.11) it is at first sight not possible to determine which one is meant in these six texts. Yet further research will show that with regard to four of these texts it can be determined which Bēl-ittannu is meant.

In two texts the seal impressions are a decisive means to determine which *ustarbaru* is involved: in PBS 2/1 104 and TuM 2/3 204 Bēl-ittannu uses the same seal (no. 409) as Bēl-ittannu / Bēl-uballiṭ, the *ustarbaru*.

In PBS 2/1 126 Bēl-ittannu is mentioned together with Marduk, who was apparently a colleague of his. The same two appear in PBS 2/1 104, which makes it likely that PBS 2/1 126 mentions Bēl-ittannu / Bēl-uballiṭ as well. The seal on this text (no. 576) belongs most likely to another Bēl-ittannu, who is mentioned as the instigator of the litigation that is the subject of the text.<sup>23</sup>

Three texts remain to be studied: EE 52, PBS 2/1 207, and RA 86 75. The lattermost one quite likely refers to Bēl-ittannu / Bēl-uballiṭ, because it is related to PBS 2/1 126. Two aspects point to this: (1) both texts are drafted in Susa within eight days of each other and (2) both texts have some witnesses in common: Šataḫme and Bēlšunu, the sons of Labaši, on the one hand, and the *ustarbarus* Bēl-ittannu and Bēl-tabtannu-bullissu, on the other.

The evidence for EE 52 and PBS 2/1 207 is more problematic, but still two aspects may be used to gain insight: the function of Bēl-ittannu and his title. In all texts Bēl-ittannu is a witness and he is never called *ustarbaru ša šarri*. This is also the case for EE 52 and PBS 2/1 207. While neither of these aspects apply, for example, to Bēl-ittannu / Naʿesī, who is always called *ustarbaru ša šarri*, it must be noted that Marduk (no. 1.1.19) is once called *ustarbaru ša šarri* and two times *ustarbaru*.

Finally, three texts mention a person Bēl-ittannu / Bēl-uballiṭ, without any title: BE 10 56 (–/–/1 Darius II = 423–422), 64 (18/III/3 Darius II = 3 Jul 421), and PBS 2/1 154 (15/V/[2] Darius II = 11 Aug 422). In the first text Ninurta-aḫ-ušur, Bēl-ittannu's servant, receives an amount of silver from an agent of the Murašû family. The text itself does not mention Bēl-ittannu as son of Bēl-uballiṭ (the text is broken where the father's name is), but its content suggests a restoration of his name in line 2.<sup>24</sup> As the role of Bēl-ittannu is in accordance with the role of other *ustarbarus*, it is probable, though not certain, that the *ustarbaru* Bēl-ittannu is meant here.

Concerning the second text (BE 10 64), Clay identifies this Bēl-ittannu with the famous *ustarbaru*.<sup>25</sup> If he is correct, then yet another seal is being used by Bēl-ittannu (no. 388). Bregstein prefers not to identify him with the *ustarbaru*, because both the name and the patronymic are frequent ones in Nippur.<sup>26</sup> Nevertheless, she does not exclude such identification, arguing that possibly he used seal no. 388 until he received his *ustarbaru*-title, following which he started to use seal no. 409. According to Bregstein, Bēl-ittannu would have had to become *ustarbaru* between the third and fifth month of year 3 of Darius II; unfortunately this cannot be correct, since seal no. 409 is already used in EE 109, which is dated to the accession year of Darius II (9/XII/0 = 20 Mar 423) and is thus older than BE 10 64. If Bregstein were right Bēl-ittannu would have used two seals concurrently, which is rather unlikely.<sup>27</sup> Accordingly, it is still better to assume that Bēl-ittannu (seal no. 388) and Bēl-ittannu (seal no. 409) are not identical.

In PBS 2/1 154 the case is even more problematic. Bēl-ittannu is simply named as the first witness, but it cannot be determined whether he was also *ustarbaru*. The text is — through its nearly identical list of witnesses<sup>28</sup> — closely related to PBS 2/1 44, 49, 155, and 157, but unfortunately only one of these texts mentions Bēl-ittannu / Bēl-uballiṭ. Bēl-tabtannu-bullissu occurs in three of these texts and the fact that he is also attested together with Bēl-ittannu (PBS 2/1 126 and RA 86 75; they both accompanied Rīmūt-Ninurta, a member of the Murašû family, to Susa in 417) offers circumstantial evidence that cannot easily be dismissed. It looks plausible to assume that PBS 2/1 154 indeed mentions Bēl-ittannu / Bēl-uballiṭ, the *ustarbaru*.

<sup>23</sup> Bregstein, "Seal Use," p. 981.

<sup>24</sup> See Kohler and Ungnad, *Hundert ausgewählte Rechtsurkunden*, p. 22.

<sup>25</sup> Clay, *Business Documents of Murashû*, p. 44.

<sup>26</sup> Bregstein, "Seal Use," p. 810 no. 409n.

<sup>27</sup> See Bregstein, "Seal Use," p. 365.

<sup>28</sup> PBS 2/1 44: Bēl-ittannu / Bēl-zēr-līšir, Ninurta-mutirri-gimilli / Nabû-aḫḫē-iddin, Bēl-tabtannu-bullissu / Bēl-ēriš, Šum-iddin / Ina-šilli-Ninurta and Enlil-ibni / Ibâ.

PBS 2/1 49: Bēl-ittannu / Bēl-bullissu, Ninurta-mutirri-gimilli / Nabû-aḫḫē-iddin, Bēl-tabtannu-bullissu / Bēl-ēriš, Šum-iddin / Ina-šilli-Ninurta and Enlil-ibni / Ibâ.

PBS 2/1 154: Bēl-ittannu / Bēl-uballiṭ, Ninurta-mutirri-gimilli / Nabû-aḫḫē-iddin, Bēl-tabtannu-bullissu / Bēl-iddin, Šum-iddin / Ina-šilli-Ninurta and Enlil-ibni / Ibâ.

PBS 2/1 155: Bēl-ittannu / Bēl-bullissu, Ninurta-mutirri-gimilli / Nabû-aḫḫē-iddin, Bēl-tabtannu-bullissu / Bēl-ēriš, Šum-iddin / Ina-šilli-Ninurta and Enlil-ibni / Ibâ.

PBS 2/1 157: Bēl-ittannu / Bēl-bullissu, Ninurta-mutirri-gimilli / Nabû-aḫḫē-iddin, Bēl-tabtannu-bullissu / Bēl-iddin, Šum-iddin / Ina-šilli-Ninurta and Enlil-ibni / Ibâ.

All texts but one (PBS 2/1 154) are written by the same scribe: Bēlet-ušabši, the son of Rēme-šukun.

The dates of these texts are also quite close to each other. Despite the broken dates of PBS 2/1 154 and 157, it may be assumed that they too were dated in the second year of Darius II. PBS 2/1 44 dates to 9 May 422, while the other four texts were all drafted between 11 and 16 August 422.



Needless to say, there are many mentionings of persons named Bēl-ittannu without patronymic or appellative. Nevertheless, in one text (PBS 2/1 44, dated 22/V/2 Darius II = 18 Aug 422) it is quite sure that Bēl-ittannu is the *ustarbaru*. The reason for assuming this is the same as that given for PBS 2/1 154. In PBS 2/1 44 Bēl-ittannu leases agricultural products from Rībat, a servant of Rīmūt-Ninurta.

To summarize, it may be accepted that Bēl-ittannu / Bēl-uballiṭ, *ustarbaru*, is attested in the following texts: BE 10 80; EE 109; PBS 2/1 44, 63, 76, 104, 126, 154, 224; RA 86 75; TuM 2/3 204. Their dates range from 9/XII/0 to 13/VI/7 Darius II (= 20 Mar 423 to 10 Sep 417). Two texts probably but not certainly refer to him: EE 52 and PBS 2/1 207. One mention of Bēl-ittannu / Bēl-uballiṭ (BE 10 64) does most likely not refer to the *ustarbaru*.

#### 1.1.11. Bēl-ittannu / Naʿesī (ring no. 160)

This person, a royal *ustarbaru*, occurs in only one text (PBS 2/1 65), dated to 19/VI/3 Darius II (= 10 Oct 421), where he sells four slaves to Rīmūt-Ninurta. He also impressed the tablet with his ring. While his father has an Egyptian name, his own name is Babylonian. Naʿesī is possibly an abbreviation for Paṭaniʿesī;<sup>29</sup> another *ustarbaru* called Paṭniʿesī (1.1.23) might be the same person. This is, however, hypothetical.

#### 1.1.12. Bēlšunu

In AIONS 77 1 Bēlšunu (a Babylonian name) deposits 1,5 talents of silver. This contract is dated to 11+/-/7 Artaxerxes I, II, or III, that is, in 458/457, 398/397, or 352/351.

#### 1.1.13. Bēl-tabtannu-bullissu / Bēl-ēriš (seal no. 326)

His Babylonian name is spelled <sup>md</sup>Bēl-tab-tan-DIN-su (four times) and <sup>md</sup>Bēl-tat-tan-DIN-su (three times), but his title and patronymic prove that one individual is meant. According to H. Torczyner the sign TAB could be pronounced /ta/.<sup>30</sup>

Bēl-tabtannu-bullissu appears with his title in four texts (PBS 2/1 48, 96, 126; RA 86 75), always as a witness. Once he is attested together with Bēl-ittannu (1.1.10) and Marduk (1.1.19; PBS 2/1 126) and once with Bēl-ittannu (1.1.10) and Šum-ušur (1.1.29; RA 86 75). The texts date from 13/V/2 to 14/XI/6 Darius II (= 9 Jun 422 to 18 Feb 417) and have different contents: one receipt of payment (PBS 2/1 48), one lease (PBS 2/1 96), and two litigations (PBS 2/1 126 and RA 86 75).

He is also attested three times without the title of *ustarbaru* in three leases (PBS 2/1 44, 49, and 155). In these texts he also functions as a witness. The first of the texts, PBS 2/1 44, is dated to 10/II/2 Darius II (= 9 May 422). PBS 2/1 49 was drafted on 16/V/2 (= 12 Aug 422). Although the date of PBS 2/1 155 is broken (16/V/x Darius II), it is quite probable that this contract was also drafted on 12 August 422. Two aspects point to this: (1) there is not much room for a longer year number according to the copy and (2) the lists of witnesses of both texts are identical. Moreover, the same scribe wrote both texts.

The texts are drafted both in Nippur and Susa and their dates are in accordance with this assumption. Bēl-tabtannu-bullissu spent the year 422 in Nippur, while in 417 he made his trip to Susa, together with Bēl-ittannu.<sup>31</sup>

Text	Date	Place
PBS 2/1 44	9 May 422	Nippur
PBS 2/1 48	9 Jun 422	Nippur
PBS 2/1 49	12 Aug 422	Nippur
PBS 2/1 155	12 Aug 422	Nippur
PBS 2/1 96	9 Mar 419	Nippur
PBS 2/1 126	10 Feb 417	Susa
RA 86 75	18 Feb 417	Susa

<sup>29</sup> E.g., P3-dj-nj-š.t “he who has been given to me by Isis” (see Hermann Ranke, *Die ägyptischen Personennamen*, Vol. 1: *Verzeichnis der Namen* [Glückstadt: Augustin, 1935], p. 40; Ran Zadok, “Egyptians in Babylonia and Elam during the 1st Millennium B.C.,” *Lingua Aegyptia* 2 [1992]: 145), rendered in Greek by Πετενιῆσις. See also Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen*, p. 84 n. 3 and p. 86.

<sup>30</sup> Harry Torczyner, review of *Business Documents of Murashû Sons of Nippur, Dated in the Reign of Darius II*, by Albert T. Clay, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 67 (1913): 137.

<sup>31</sup> Other Murašû texts drafted in Susa are IMT 46, PBS 2/1 113, and PBS 2/1 128. Four of these texts form a cluster, which indicates that Rīmūt-Ninurta spent the late winter of 317 in Susa. Thereby he was accompanied by various people, among whom were some scribes (Matthew W. Stolper, “The Murašû Texts from Susa,” *Revue d’Assyriologie et d’archéologie orientale* 86 [1992]: 71–74) as well as some *ustarbarus*.

1.1.14. *Enlil-šum-ibni*

In IMT 3, dated 5 February 430, a canal is named after this *ustarbaru*, who has a Babylonian name.

1.1.15. *Ipraduparna*<sup>32</sup>

This person has an Iranian name and appears in BE 10 114, drafted on 8/X/6 Darius II (14 Jan 417). In this text Paruḫātu (seal no. 524), his bailiff (*paqdu*), receives rent for land from Rīmūt-Ninurta. He is also attested without his title, namely, in a text (PBS 2/1 138) from year 7 of Darius II (417/416). This text has a seal caption of Barsipai (seal no. 525), the bailiff of Ipraduparnâ.

1.1.16. *Kiribti-Bēl / Bēl-šar-ibni* (ring no. 603)

This *ustarbaru*, bearing a Babylonian name, is attested as a witness in BE 10 89, a receipt of a payment, dated to 23/VIII/4 Darius II (= 22 Nov 420).

1.1.17. *Linūḫ-libbi-ilī* (ring no. 288)

Royal *ustarbaru* acting as a witness and sealing the tablet is Linūḫ-libbi-ilī (BE 10 91; date: 11/IX/4 Darius II = 10 Dec 420). His name is Babylonian.

1.1.18. *Mannukia / Aḫḫê-iqīša*

Attested in AIONS 77 1, dated to the seventh year of a King Artaxerxes (i.e., either in 458/457, 398/397, or 352/351). The text mentions that the transaction was recorded in the presence of Mannukia, who is listed before the witnesses. Both his name and the name of his father are Babylonian.

1.1.19. *Marduk* (seal no. 460)

This person occurs in three texts as a witness: in BE 10 15 (as a royal *ustarbaru*) together with Paṭani'esī (1.1.23), in PBS 2/1 104 together with Bēl-ittannu (1.1.10), and in PBS 2/1 126, a text drafted in Susa,<sup>33</sup> together with Bēl-ittannu and Bēl-tabtannu-bullissu (1.1.13). The dates range from 8/II/1 to 6/XI/6 Darius II (= 18 May 423 to 10 Feb 417). His name is obviously Babylonian. His title of "royal *ustarbaru*" is attested in the first-drafted text. This could mean that he was stripped of his title later (between Darius II 1 and 5), but equally it could be scribal negligence or convention. The text BE 10 15 also mentions an uš-ta-ba-ri (line 20). According to Cardascia<sup>34</sup> this is an unusual writing for us-tar-ba-ri. Yet the first part does not contain -r-, so the title must be different. Some scholars<sup>35</sup> have \*uštrabāra- "camel driver" in mind, but such a title does not correspond with the Babylonian spelling.<sup>36</sup> The translations "riding at will" and "wanting instructions" are not plausible.<sup>37</sup> Possibly the expression should be read \*ušta-bāra- "driver of oxen."<sup>38</sup>

1.1.20. *Nanâ-iddin* (seal no. 198)

Nanâ-iddin is attested as a witness in three texts. One of these texts (TuM 2/3 204) is impressed with his seal. The other two texts are BE 10 102 and 103. The dates range from 7/VI/5 to 23/X/5 Darius II (= 28 Aug 419 to 10 Jan 418).

Because he is mentioned together with Bēl-ittannu (1.1.10) in TuM 2/3 204, Eilers argues that Bēl-ittannu and Nanâ-iddin are brothers.<sup>39</sup> However, the lack of a patronymic makes such an assumption rather insecure. Other texts also mention more than one *ustarbaru* next to each other.

<sup>32</sup> \*Frādafarnā, nom. sg. of \*Frādafarnah- "furthering glory" (Hinz, *Altiranisches Sprachgut*, p. 96; Zadok, "Iranians and Individuals," p. 110 and nn. 235–36; Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, p. 86; Tavernier, *Iranica*, p. 180 no. 4.2.579).

<sup>33</sup> Stolper, "Murašû Texts from Susa," pp. 75–76.

<sup>34</sup> Cardascia, *Les archives des Murašû*, p. 161 n. 3.

<sup>35</sup> Georg Hüsing, *Poruštētiš und das achāmānidische Lehenswesen*, Bausteine zur Geschichte, Völkerkunde, und Mythenkunde, *Ergänzungs-*

heft 2, 2nd ed. (Vienna: Eichendorff-Haus, 1933), p. 42; Hinz, *Altiranisches Sprachgut*, p. 247.

<sup>36</sup> Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen*, pp. 104–06.

<sup>37</sup> "Riding at Will," in Hinz, *Altiranisches Sprachgut*, p. 247. "Nach Weisung hegend," in Manfred Mayrhofer, apud AHW. s.v. uštabari.

<sup>38</sup> Vladimir A. Livšic, apud Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, p. 86.

<sup>39</sup> Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen*, pp. 84 and 88.

1.1.21. *Ninakku*,<sup>40</sup> the Agent of *Zatamē* (seal no. 262)

Ninakku, mentioned with both his titles (agent of *Zatamē* and *ustarbaru*), witnesses a lease of a plot of land by Aplā to Enlil-šum-iddin. He also seals the text (PBS 2/1 30), drafted on 18/-/1 Darius II (= sometime in 423–422). His name is Iranian.

In four texts he appears without the title of *ustarbaru* (BE 9 45, BE 9 50, EE 7, EE 12). The dates of these texts range from 20/V/36 to some point in year 40 of Artaxerxes I (= 1 Sep 429–425/424). Three times he is listed as the first witness, in EE 7 he is the third witness.

Since he only appears with the title of *ustarbaru* in the reign of Darius II and not in that of Artaxerxes I, it is possible that he received this title shortly after the throne accession of Darius II (cf. *infra*).

1.1.22. *Parnuš*<sup>41</sup> / *Šibbû*

He is attested as *ustarbaru* in two texts (PBS 2/1 70 and 102; dates range from 22/IX/3 to some point in year 4 of Darius II = 31 Dec 421 to 420/419). He is, however, only attested indirectly, since the active parties in these two texts are Rīmūt-Ninurta, on the one hand, and Barikia (seal nos. 63 and 285), the son of Isparda and the bailiff of Parnuš (an Iranian name), on the other hand. Barikia receives the *imit eqli* and rent, a total of 12 shekels of silver, for land from Rīmūt-Ninurta. In BE 10 103 and PBS 2/1 98 (dates range from 17/-/4 to 23/X/5 Darius II = 420/419 to 10 Jan 418) Parnuš is mentioned without his title. In the former text Barikia, receiving rent from Rīmūt-Ninurta, again is one of the contracting parties. In the latter text Bēl-ibni (seal no. 558), a servant of his, receives rent for land from Rīmūt-Ninurta.

Three of these four texts (BE 10 103; PBS 2/1 70, 102) seem to deal with the same plot of land, located in Bāb Nār Dirāt. They record the receipt of the rent from the third to fifth years of Darius II. PBS 2/1 98 concerns the rent of a plot of land in *Ḥuṣṣēti ša* [ ]. This means that Parnuš possessed at least two plots of land. Zadok<sup>42</sup> assumes that the name of the settlement in PBS 2/1 98 should be restored to *Ḥuṣṣēti ša* <sup>md</sup>Bābu-ēreš, on the basis of its occurrence in PBS 2/1 43, a text where Parnuš's father Šibbû appears as owner of land in the same settlements. It is likely that both texts deal with the same plot of land. In that case either Parnuš inherited the land after his father's death or Šibbû donated the land to his son while still living.

1.1.23. *Paṭani'esī*

This person, called *ustarbaru ša šarri* ("royal *ustarbaru*"), acts as a witness in a lease contract (BE 10 15) between Bēl-īdišu and Enlil-šum-iddin, a member of the Murašû family. The text was drafted on 8/II/1 Darius II (= 18 May 423). He is accompanied by Marduk (1.1.19), a colleague of his, who is also called *ustarbaru ša šarri*. He could be the father of Bēl-ittannu (1.1.11) and his name is Egyptian.

1.1.24. *Pitibirī*

Pitibirī is an Egyptian name<sup>43</sup> whose bearer occurs in two texts drafted on the same day (13/I/8 Darius II = 5 May 416). TuM 2/3 148 is the record of a lease of a plot of land, property of Pitibirī, by Bēl-aḥ-ušabši / Marduk, the bailiff of Pitibirī, to Murašû, the son of Enlil-šum-iddin. Murašû paid his rent for the first year on the same day the lease was drawn up, as is illustrated by the receipt BE 10 129: four clerks of Murašû handed over the rent to Bēl-aḥ-ušabši. Both texts were sealed by Bēl-aḥ-ušabši / Marduk (ring no. 613<sup>44</sup> and witnessed and sealed<sup>45</sup> by, among others, Bābu-iddin / Bēlšunu (seal no. 59), the bailiff of the estate of Siṭunu, which was given to Pitibirī, and Pani'esī (seal no. 305), a servant of Pitibirī. Marduk, the father of Bēl-aḥ-ušabši, is possibly the same individual as Marduk, the *ustarbaru* (1.1.19).

<sup>40</sup> \*Nināka- "he who is beating" (Livšic, apud Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, p. 106; Tavernier, *Iranica*, p. 260 no. 4.2.1191).

<sup>41</sup> \*Parnuš "the old one" (Hinz, *Altiranisches Sprachgut*, p. 180; Ran Zadok, review of *Altiranisches Sprachgut der Nebenüberlieferungen*, by Walther Hinz, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 33 [1976]: 214; idem, "Iranians and Individuals," p. 110 n. 234; Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, p. 110; Tavernier, *Iranica*, pp. 264–65 no. 4.2.1223).

<sup>42</sup> Zadok, *Geographical Names*, p. 171.

<sup>43</sup> The first element, represented by Pi-ti-, is probably Egyptian P3-di "given by," despite the possible objection that the better representation would be pi-ti-. The second element is not yet convincingly analyzed. P3-irj "the companion" is possible, but in that case the new name \*P3-di-p3-irj is problematic. An alternative possibil-

ity is P3-di-p3-Rc "given by Re," but the sign RI is not an adequate rendering of Rc (Günther Vittmann, pers. comm.; see also Dem. Nb. 529). Yet, as the final vocal was not pronounced in Late Babylonian, this problem may be dismissed. Moreover, the value *re* for RI already stands closer to the Egyptian original.

<sup>44</sup> Bregstein, "Seal Use," p. 1018.

<sup>45</sup> TuM 2/3 148 is impressed with the seal of Enlil-iddin / Enlil-[ ], who does not occur elsewhere in the text. Either this is an otherwise unattested individual or he can be identified with someone already known. Possibilities are (1) Enlil-iddin / Enlil-kāšir (EE 89), (2) Enlil-iddin / Enlil-kišir (JCS 53 89 no. 3), or (3) Enlil-iddin / Enlil-uballit (e.g. BE 10 29, 125; PBS 2/1 117; TuM 2/3 184), who has two seals (nos. 73 and 500).

1.1.25. *Rībat* (seal no. 186)

This *ustarbaru* witnesses a receipt for a payment of taxes (PBS 2/1 128) drafted in Susa on 10/XII/6 Darius II (= 15 Mar 417). His name is Babylonian.

1.1.26. *Siamû*<sup>46</sup> (ring no. 367)

The presence of the ring seal of the bearer of this Iranian name on PBS 2/1 38 (drafted in 423–422), in a text on which the list of witnesses is not preserved, indicates that he was a witness to this contract. He is called the *ustarbaru* of Parysatis.

1.1.27. *Šamû*<sup>47</sup>

One of the servants of this *ustarbaru* occurs in a contract from Susa (Fs Perrot 173 no. 1). Unfortunately the date is completely broken, with the only element preserved being the name of a King Artaxerxes. The *ustarbaru*'s name (spelled <sup>m</sup>Šá-mu-ú) is Egyptian,<sup>48</sup> but his patronymic is not mentioned. In another text from Susa (Fs Perrot 177 no. 2) he is mentioned as the one who sealed the tablet recording the purchase of a plot of land. Many people in both texts also bear Egyptian names.<sup>49</sup>

In PBS 2/1 130, a tax receipt, <sup>m</sup>Šá-mu-ú is called *ša rēš šarri*, the usual designation for a court official. *Šamû* sealed the text with his ring (no. 270). The rarity of the name, in combination with the fact that the *Murašû* conducted parts of their business in Susa, confirms the prosopographical identity of *Šamû* the *ša rēš šarri* and *Šamû* the *ustarbaru*. This makes it possible to date the text from Susa (Fs Perrot 173 no. 1) to the end of the reign of Artaxerxes I.<sup>50</sup>

1.1.28. *Šibbû*

In PBS 2/1 43 *Bēl-ibni*, the bailiff of *Šibbû*, and *Kešaya*, the servant of *Šibbû*, receive rent for a plot of land from *Rīmūt-Ninurta*. The contract was drafted on 2/II/2 Darius II (= 1 May 422). *Šibbû* is the Babylonian representation of an Iranian name.<sup>51</sup> *Bēl-ibni* sealed the document (ring no. 561), while *Kešaya* printed his nail in it.

1.1.29. *Šum-ušur* (seal no. 638)

He occurs as a witness (together with *Bēl-ittannu* and *Bēl-tattannu-bullissu*) in a litigation drafted in Susa on 14/XI/6 Darius II (= 18 Feb 417), a text which he sealed (RA 86 75). The name is Babylonian.

<sup>46</sup> \*Syāva- “the black one” (Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen*, p. 87; Hinz, *Altiranisches Sprachgut*, p. 229; Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, p. 119; Tavernier, *Iranica*, p. 316 no. 4.2.1620).

<sup>47</sup> The same name also occurs in other texts from first-millennium Babylonia and is thus not a hapax, as Joannès believes (Joannès, “Textes babyloniens de Suse,” p. 178). In OECT 10 285 <sup>m</sup>Šá-am-mu-ú appears in a broken context. A man with the same name is a slave of As-ma-a (or As-ba-a) in Borsippa in the year 443–442 B.C. (VS 3 189; see Zadok, “Egyptians in Babylonia and Elam,” p. 142). There is also an irrigated farmland called É-<sup>m</sup>Šá-mu-ú (*Bit-Šamû*) mentioned in TCL 12 85 (551 B.C.) and TuM 2/3 1 (550 B.C.). See Mariano San Nicolò, “Due atti matrimoniali neobabilonesi,” *Aegyptus* 27 (1947): 121, for the reading (followed by Martha T. Roth, *Babylonian Marriage Agreements: 7th–3rd Centuries B.C.*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 222 [Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989], p. 53). Francis Joannès, *Archives de Borsippa: la famille Ea-ilûta-Bâni; étude d'un lot d'archives familiales en Babylonie du VIII<sup>e</sup> au V<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-Chr.*, Hautes études orientales 25 (Geneva: Droz, 1989), pp. 165 and 309, reads É-<sup>m</sup>A-mu-ú. See also Zadok, *Geographical Names*, p. 105.

The name is also attested in the *Murašû* archive. The oldest attestation dates from 4/I/ 41 Artaxerxes I (= 25 Apr 424), when a person called *Šamû*, the son of <sup>m</sup>Pa-ta-aḥ, and his colleagues (messengers of Mannu-ki-Ea, and a servant of Manuštanu) receive tax from someone (BE 9 84 = TuM 2/3 202). In PBS 2/1 54 (20/X/2 Darius II = 10 Jan 421) Enlil-iddin and *Bēl-ittannu*, the sons of <sup>m</sup>Šá-am-mu-ú, have a lease agreement with *Rīmūt-Ninurta*. Another lease contract (PBS 2/1 96; 12/XII/ 4 Darius II = 9 Mar 419) is sealed (no. 4) by <sup>m</sup>Šá-mu-ú A-šú šá m<sup>r</sup>x<sup>1</sup>-[x]-a.

It should also be noted that the name, spelled *šmw*, is attested in an Aramaic inheritance document from Saqqara (ATNS 28: 1). Because he is the son of Snbnt (apparently Semitic, perhaps a compound with *Sîn*) and the brother of Bryk<sup>3</sup>l (Barik-<sup>3</sup>El), Segal thought the name to be Semitic, but more scholars favor an Egyptian origin and accordingly a homonymy with the Babylonian spellings. Semitic origin: J. B. Segal, *Aramaic Texts from North Saqqâra, with some Fragments in Phoenician*, Excavations at North Saqqâra, Documentary Series 4, Texts from Excavations 6 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1983), p. 44. Egyptian origin: Walter Kornfeld, *Onomastica Aramaica aus Ägypten*, Sitzungsberichte der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 333 (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978), p. 94; Ran Zadok, review of *Aramaic Texts from North Saqqâra*, by J. B. Segal, *Die Welt des Orient* 16 [1985]: 174; Günther Vittmann, “Zu den ägyptischen Entsprechungen aramäisch überlieferter Personennamen,” *Orientalia*, n.s., 58 (1989): 229.

<sup>48</sup> Tj-jim-w “who seizes” (Ran Zadok, “On Some Foreign Population Groups in First-millennium Babylonia,” *Tel Aviv* 6 [1979]: 173; idem, “Egyptians in Babylonia and Elam,” p. 142; see Ranke, *Die ägyptischen Personennamen*, p. 387 no. 13). Joannès, “Textes babyloniens de Suse,” p. 178, considers the name to be a variant of the Middle Babylonian name *Šamûa*.

<sup>49</sup> Joannès, “Textes babyloniens de Suse,” p. 178.

<sup>50</sup> Michael Jursa, “‘Höflinge’ (*ša rēši*, *ša rēš šarri*, *ustarbaru*) in babylonischen Quellen des ersten Jahrtausends,” in *Die Welt des Ktesias/ Ctesias' World*, edited by J. Wiesehöfer, R. Röllinger, and G. B. Lanfranchi, *Classica et Orientalia* 1 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011), p. 170.

<sup>51</sup> Šibava- “path” (Tavernier, *Iranica*, p. 319 no. 4.2.1642).

1.1.30. *Tiriadatu*<sup>52</sup>

According to a text (Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen*, pl. 3) drafted on 8/VII/12 Darius II (= 11 Oct 412),<sup>53</sup> this *ustarbaru* leased a destroyed house (*bītu abta*). Most likely, the king meant here is Darius II.<sup>54</sup> Along with his Iranian name he has a Babylonian one: Nabû-kāšir.

1.1.31. *Zababa-iddin*

In BE 9 28, a text drafted on 18/VII/31 Artaxerxes I (= 23 Oct 434), Hurru, the deputy (*šanu*) of the *ustarbaru* Zababa-iddin, receives rent for land from Enlil-šum-iddin.

According to Hilprecht Zababa-iddin, the *ustarbaru*, is identical with Zababa-iddin / Zababa-ēriš, who appears in BE 9 95.<sup>55</sup> This text records the lease of a field by Zababa-iddin, his brother Bēl-aḥ-iddin, and some other persons (among others Bēl-ēṭir / Barik-il) for the rent of 2,155 kur of dates. Zababa-iddin also occurs in EE 63, where he is called Zababa-šum-iddin and where he is again mentioned as leasing a field together with inter alia Bēl-ēṭir / Barik-il. One of the witnesses of both texts (BE 9 95 and EE 63) is also the same: Arad-Enlil / Širikti-Ninurta.

1.1.32. *Name Broken*

This person, whose name is unfortunately not preserved, is attested as a witness in a badly damaged contract (BM 34974 = Sp II 497<sup>56</sup>). The date of the text is most likely year 14 of Darius I (508/507). Despite the absence of a royal name, the construction PN a-šú šá PN is typical for the sixth century and, in that case, only the reign of Darius I can fit the mentioning of a fourteenth year.<sup>57</sup>

1.1.33. *Ḥaṭru šá* <sup>LÚ</sup>*ustaribarra*

Attention should also be given to the *ḥaṭru*, which is named after the *ustarbaru*. It is attested in the promissory note BE 10 32 (26/IV/1 Darius II = 3 Aug 423).

Possibly the function/title of *ustarbaru* was hereditary and was kept within a particular family.<sup>58</sup> The low number of examples is, however, not convincing enough to take such a hereditary aspect for granted. The examples are:

1. Šibbû and his son Parnuš.<sup>59</sup> Their familial relationship is quite plausible.<sup>60</sup> Henkelman plays with the idea that Parnuš, mentioned in PF 2050 as a *karamaraš*-official, is also an *ustarbaru* and perhaps an ancestor of Šibbû and Parnuš. Yet this cannot be proven, first of all since one may not assume that the Persepolitan Parnuš indeed was an *ustarbaru*. Even so, it remains impossible to determine whether the Persepolitan Parnuš had any familial relationship with Šibbû and Parnuš.
2. The name of Na'esî, the father of Bēl-ittannu (1.1.11), is an abbreviation of Paṭani'esî. An *ustarbaru* Paṭani'esî (1.1.23) is attested and could very well be identical with Na'esî.<sup>61</sup>
3. Bēl-ittannu (1.1.10) and his brother Nanâ-iddin (1.1.20). However, see above for this hypothetical identification.

No *ustarbaru* as such is attested in either the reign of Artaxerxes I or Darius II. Ninakku may occur in texts from the reigns of both kings, but he is only mentioned in texts from the reign of Darius II as an *ustarbaru*. Moreover, his first attestation as *ustarbaru* dates from the first regnal year of Darius II, which may point to a direct connection between the throne accession of Darius II and the appointment of Ninakku as *ustarbaru*. The other three regularly mentioned *ustarbarus* (Bēl-itannu/Bēl-uballit, Bēl-tattannu-bullissu/Bēl-ēreš, and Marduk) only start appearing from the accession year of Darius II onward.

<sup>52</sup> \*Tīryadāta- "given by Tīrya" (Hinz, *Altiranisches Sprachgut*, p. 238; Zadok, "Iranians and Individuals," p. 170; Tavernier, *Iranica*, p. 327 no. 4.2.1713).

<sup>53</sup> See Jursa, "Höfliche," p. 170.

<sup>54</sup> See Joannès and Lemaire, "Contrats babyloniens," p. 54 n. 24. Certainly not Darius I, as Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen*, p. 115, believed.

<sup>55</sup> Hilprecht and Clay, *Business Documents of Murashû*, p. 73.

<sup>56</sup> For a copy of this text, see Otto Neugebauer, *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity*, *Acta historica scientiarum naturalium et medicinalium* 9, 2nd ed. (Providence: Brown University Press, 1957), pl. 14.

<sup>57</sup> Jursa, "Höfliche," p. 170 n. 63.

<sup>58</sup> Henkelman, "An Elamite Memorial," p. 162.

<sup>59</sup> Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen*, pp. 88–89; Henkelman, "An Elamite Memorial," p. 162.

<sup>60</sup> This could be corroborated by the person of Bēl-ibni as *paqdu* of Šibbû. In PBS 2/1 98 a man with the same name is servant of Parnuš. If we assume that this is the same individual, one may also believe that Parnuš and Šibbû were both *ustarbarus*. This might point to a hereditary title. Unfortunately, this cannot be safely assumed, since Bēl-ibni is a frequent name.

<sup>61</sup> Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen*, p. 89.

Most *ustarbarus* (twenty-four of them) are attested in the Murašû archive. Eighteen of those appear in texts from the reign of Darius II on. This is not all too surprising, since most Murašû texts date from the first seven years of Darius II's government.<sup>62</sup> Nevertheless it is still a bit surprising to see so few attestations of *ustarbarus* during the reign of Artaxerxes I, during whose fortieth and forty-first years a considerable number of Murašû texts were drafted. Apparently, Darius II granted various people the right to assume the title of *ustarbar*, whatever this meant in practice (cf. *infra*).

This phenomenon might be a direct result of the way Darius II got to the throne. The succession of Artaxerxes I was a rather turbulent happening, with his legal successor Xerxes II assassinated by Sogdianus, who himself later on was expelled by Darius II.<sup>63</sup> It is quite possible that the new king rewarded some of his supporters with the right to assume the title of *ustarbar*.

An indication in favor of this theory is the fact that there are only a few people who are attested bearing the same title both in the reigns of Artaxerxes I and Darius II, and the last attestation of each of them is the first year of Darius II. There are three examples: (1) Enlil-iddin / Enlil-uballit, *paqdu ša KÁ.GAL LUGAL-GU-SI-SÁ* (attested with this title from Artaxerxes 36 to Darius 1); (2) Ninurta-aḥ-iddin / Arad-Egalmah, *paqdu ša KÁ.GAL IGI-BI ŠEŠ.UNU<sup>KI</sup>.ŠÈ* (attested with this title from Artaxerxes 36 to Darius 1); and (3) Ninurta-ana-bītišu / Lu-idija, *paqdu ša KÁ.GAL GU-LA* (attested with his title from Artaxerxes 36 to Darius 1). These three people, all *paqdu*s at one of the city gates, are only attested until the first year of Darius II. One might start to believe that the end of the reign of Artaxerxes I marked for many officials the end of their position.

Finally it may be noted that although the *ustarbarus* appear chiefly in texts from Nippur, they also appear in Babylon, Ḥuṣ-Šagibi, and Susa. One text from Babylon deals with property in Bīt-Abī-rām, others refer to property in Bāb Nār Dirāt or Ḥuṣṣēti ša <sup>md</sup>Bābu-ēreš.

## 1.2. Linguistic and Ethnic Affiliation of the Anthroponyms

Seventeen personal names, belonging to eighteen individuals,<sup>64</sup> are Babylonian: Bēl-bullissu, Bēl-ēṭir, Bēl-ibukaš, Bēl-īdiš, Bēl-ittannu, Bēlšunu, Bēl-tabtannu-bullissu, Enlil-šum-ibni, Kiribtī-Bēl, Linūḫ-libbi-ilī, Mannukia, Marduk, Nabû-kāšir, Nanā-iddin, Rībat, Šum-ušur, and Zababa-iddin.

There are eleven Iranian names, belonging to twelve persons: \*Bagadāta-, \*Bagamihra-, \*Bagapāta-, \*Bagazušta-, \*Frādafarnā, \*Nināka-, \*Parnuš, \*Syāva-, \*Šibava-, and \*Tīryadāta-.

Finally three *ustarbarus* have an Egyptian anthroponym: Paṭani'esī, Pitibirī, and Šamû.

As is well known, the study of the relation between anthroponyms and ethnicity is fraught with problems. People may have changed their names in order to have a greater possibility of an administrative career, etc. Even patronymics are not without danger. Still, it may be worth having a look at the linguistic combinations of the names themselves and their patronymics. The most frequent combination (four times) is a Babylonian name with a Babylonian patronymic. Two times an Iranian name has an Iranian patronymic. Each of the following combinations are attested once: Iranian name-Babylonian patronymic, Iranian name-Egyptian patronymic, Babylonian name-Iranian patronymic, Babylonian name-West Semitic patronymic, Babylonian name-Egyptian patronymic. The combinations where the anthroponym belongs to the same language as the patronymic assume a relatively certain ethnicity. It is possible that an Iranian anthroponym with a Babylonian patronymic indicates that the person was a Babylonian who changed his name to an Iranian one. Another person who changed his name to an Iranian one is Bagazuštu / Marḥarpu (1.1.5), who is explicitly called an Egyptian.<sup>65</sup> The ethnicity of the other persons cannot be traced. Perhaps the bearers of the Egyptian names were Egyptians.

Unfortunately, we know only eleven patronymics of *ustarbarus*. The reason for this is most likely that the people did not necessarily need to know the father's name when the title of the person discussed was sufficient for identification.

## 1.3. Spellings and Etymology of the Appellative

### 1.3.1. The Various Spellings of the Appellative

As can be expected for a foreign word, *ustarbar* appears in different spellings.<sup>66</sup> The restored passages are not included in table 22.1.

<sup>62</sup> Donbaz and Stolper, *Istanbul Murašû Texts*, p. 6.

<sup>63</sup> Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire*, pp. 114–16; Briant, *Histoire de l'empire perse*, pp. 605–06.

<sup>64</sup> Note that Nabû-kāšir is the same individual as \*Tīryadāta-.

<sup>65</sup> It is interesting to see that an Egyptian had the title of *ustarbar* in 496 B.C., i.e., a bit more than thirty years after the Persian conquest of Egypt.

<sup>66</sup> Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen*, pp. 81–82; Tavernier, *Iranica*, p. 435.

Table 22.1. Spellings and etymology of the appellative

1.1.3.1. Without syncope of the middle vocal (-VrVb-)	
a) us-ta-ra-ba-ri (twice)	
<i>Text:</i> Eilers, <i>Iranische Beamtennamen</i> , pl. 3	<i>Scribe:</i> Bēl-uballit / Ubar
<i>Date:</i> 10 Oct 393 or 11 Oct 347	<i>Place:</i> Babylon
b) us-ta-ri-ba-ri (once)	
<i>Text:</i> BE 10 9	<i>Scribe:</i> Šula / Ninurta-nāšir
<i>Date:</i> 1 Nov 404	<i>Place:</i> Nippur
c) us-ta-ri-bar-ra (once)	
<i>Text:</i> BE 10 32	<i>Scribe:</i> Ninurta-ab-ušur / Šum-iddin <sup>67</sup>
<i>Date:</i> 3 Aug 423	<i>Place:</i> Nippur
d) us-tar-ri-ba-ri (once)	
<i>Text:</i> PBS 2/1 48	<i>Scribe:</i> Ninurta-ab-ušur / Enlil-šum-iddin
<i>Date:</i> 9 Jun 422	<i>Place:</i> Nippur
1.1.3.2. With syncope of the middle vocal (-Vrb-)	
e) mus-tar-ba-ri (once) <sup>68</sup>	
<i>Text:</i> TuM 2/3 148	<i>Scribe:</i> Ninurta-ab-ušur / Enlil-šum-iddin
<i>Date:</i> 5 May 416	<i>Place:</i> Nippur
f) ú-ma-as-ta-ar-ba-ra- <sup>3</sup> (once)	
<i>Text:</i> RA 90 48–49 no. 6	<i>Scribe:</i> Itti-Gula-Balāṭu / Marduk-šum-ibni
<i>Date:</i> 17 Nov 496	<i>Place:</i> Babylon
g) us-ta-ar-ba-ri (once)	
<i>Text:</i> BE 9 102	<i>Scribe:</i> Ninurta-ab-ušur / Enlil-šum-iddin
<i>Date:</i> 30 Oct 424	<i>Place:</i> Nippur
h) us-ta-ar-pa-ri (once): inaccurate spelling of us-ta-ar-ba-ri	
<i>Text:</i> BE 9 102	<i>Scribe:</i> Ninurta-ab-ušur / Enlil-šum-iddin
<i>Date:</i> 30 Oct 424	<i>Place:</i> Nippur
i) us-ta-bar-ri (once): inaccurate spelling of us-ta-ar-bar-ri	
<i>Text:</i> BM 34974 = Sp II 497	<i>Scribe:</i> unknown
<i>Date:</i> 508/07	<i>Place:</i> Babylon
j) us-tar-ba-ar (once)	
<i>Text:</i> IMT 3	<i>Scribe:</i> Ninurta-nāšir / Arad-Enlil
<i>Date:</i> 5 Feb 430	<i>Place:</i> Nippur
k) us-tar-bar (twice)	
<i>Texts:</i> BE 10 15; PBS 2/1 126 <sup>69</sup>	<i>Scribe:</i> Ubar / Nadin (BE 10 15). The other text is broken (cf. appendix 2)
<i>Dates:</i> 18 May 423–10 Feb 417	<i>Place:</i> Nippur, Susa

<sup>67</sup> Certainly the same person as Ninurta-ab-ušur, the son of Enlil-šum-iddin (Clay, *Business Documents of Murashû*, p. 58).

<sup>68</sup> Since MUŠ and US are relatively similar to each other, Cardascia, *Les archives des Murašû*, p. 161 n. 3, believes this spelling is a scribal error for us-tar-ba-ri. This is indeed possible, because us-tar-ba-

ri was the usual way to write *ustarbaru*. One should, however, not forget that mus-tar-ba-ri is also a perfect way to render Iranian \*vastrabara-.

<sup>69</sup> Spelled us-tar-bar<sup>MEŠ</sup>. It is not sure whether the addition of the plural morpheme MEŠ has influenced the writing.

Table 22.1. Spellings and etymology of the appellative (*cont.*)

l) us-tar-ba-ri (33 times)	
<i>Texts:</i> BE 9 1, 50: 11; BE 10 15, 80, 89, 91, 102, 103, 114, 129; EE 52; PBS 2/1 30, 38, 43, 48, 63, 65, 70, 76, 96, 102, 207, 224; TuM 2/3, 204	<i>Scribes:</i> (1) Ninurta-ab-ušur / Enlil-šum-iddin (BE 10 80, 89, 91, 102, 103, 114, 129; PBS 2/1 48, 63, 65, 70, 96, 102, 207, 224; TuM 2/3 148, 204) (2) Labaši / Balātu (PBS 2/1 43, 76) (3) Nidintu-Enlil / Ninurta-nadin (BE 9 1) (4) Ninurta-našir / Arad-Enlil (BE 9 50) (5) Ubar / Nadin (BE 10 15)
<i>Dates:</i> 29 Nov 429–1 Nov 404 (oldest and youngest texts; all the other texts range between 18 May 423 and 5 May 416)	<i>Place:</i> Nippur
m) us-tar-ba-ru (once)	
<i>Text:</i> BE 9 28	<i>Scribe:</i> Aqara / Nadin
<i>Date:</i> 23 Oct 434	<i>Place:</i> Nippur
n) us-tar-bar-ra (6 times)	
<i>Texts:</i> HSM 8414; Fs Perrot 173 no. 1; PBS 2/1 128; VAT 15608	<i>Scribes:</i> (1) Bēl-našir / Nabû-bullissu-iqbi (PBS 2/1 128) (2) Bēl-tattannu-ušur / Bēlšunu (Fs Perrot 173 no. 1) (3) Unknown (HSM 8414; VAT 15608)
<i>Dates:</i> 14 Feb 417–7 Oct 386 or 8 Oct 340	<i>Places:</i> Babylon, Susa
o) us-tar-bar-ri (twice)	
<i>Text:</i> AIONS 77 1	<i>Scribe:</i> [...r]u / Bēl-aḥḥē-iddin
<i>Date:</i> 458/457, 398/397, or 352/351	<i>Place:</i> Babylon

The other attestations are too broken for a precise determination of the spelling. The most common spelling *us-tar-ba-ri* seems to be restricted to Nippur. The only scribe who wrote this spelling outside Nippur is Ubar, but he probably traveled to Babylon to write the tablet (BE 10 15), as the tablet was found in Nippur but said to be drafted in Babylon.

Sometimes the persons are mentioned without their title. If this is the case, they are mostly witnesses. Only Parrinu is mentioned two times without his title, when he is not a witness (BE 10 103 and PBS 2/1 98).

### 1.3.2. Etymology

The various spellings suggest that *ustarbar* is the Babylonian rendering of a non-Babylonian loanword. The first scholar to venture an etymology was Georg Hüsing.<sup>70</sup> After mentioning an implausible connection with Old Persian *uša-bāri* “camel-driver,”<sup>71</sup> he presents an etymological link with Avestan *vastra*– “garment.” According to him the *ustarbaru* was connected with the “Regimentskammer.” Hüsing also referred to the Susa texts, a corpus of hundreds of Neo-Elamite texts from Susa, where many words belong to the semantic category of textiles.<sup>72</sup> It should be noted that, although he was the first to discuss the expression, Hüsing was not the first one to come up with this translation. Already in 1855 Edwin Norris had a translation “keeper of the clothes” or “chamberlain.”<sup>73</sup>

Twenty-two years later Eilers formulated a reaction against this hypothesis.<sup>74</sup> If one wants to accept *\*vastrabara*– “garment-bearer,” he cannot refer to a “Regimentskammervorwalter.” The form *\*vastrabara*– would have to denote

<sup>70</sup> Georg Hüsing, “Poruštāiš und das achāmānidische Lehenwesen,” *Berichte des Forschungs-Institutes für Osten und Orient* 2 (1918): 129–31.

<sup>71</sup> This etymology was proposed and defended by some scholars (Christian Bartholomae, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch* [Strassburg: K. J. Trübner, 1904], p. 421; Antoine Meillet and Émile Benveniste, *Grammaire du vieux-perse*, 2nd ed. [Paris: H. Champion, 1931], p. 109; Ernst Herzfeld, *Altpersische Inschriften*, *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran*, *Ergänzungsband* 1 [Berlin: D. Reimer, 1938], p. 95). On the to-

tally incredible possibility *\*vadar-bara*– “weapon bearer,” see Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” pp. 118–19.

<sup>72</sup> See Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” p. 118.

<sup>73</sup> Edwin Norris, “Memoir on the Scythic Version of the Behistun Inscription,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 15 (1855): 432.

<sup>74</sup> Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen*, pp. 81 and 93–96.



someone who possesses an honorary garment, but Avestan *vastra-* is not attested meaning “honorary garment.” As an alternative solution Eilers proposes to read *\*vistarbara-*.<sup>75</sup> *\*Vistar-* “bedding, carpet, blanket, cover” is the ancestor of Middle Persian *vistar(ag)* and New Persian *gustar* “bed.” The word actually would denote the court security police, charged with keeping everyone away from the king.

The next author to be occupied with this intriguing word was Walther Hinz.<sup>76</sup> He picked up Hüsing’s proposal and proved it to be right by viewing it in light of an inscription of Darius I, that is, DNd (Darius Naqš-e Rostam d). The result is the currently accepted one.<sup>77</sup> To Hinz, *ustarbaru* is a rendering of Iranian *\*vastrabara-*, the Median equivalent of the Old Persian attested form *vaçabara-*<sup>78</sup> (DNd 1) “garment bearer.”<sup>79</sup> *\*Vastrabara-* developed to *\*vaçabara-*, which, through assimilation (*sç > çç < ç*), became *vaçabara-*.<sup>80</sup>

An edition of a Babylonian text (RA 90 48–49 no.6) corroborates Hinz’s etymological opinion. In this text the title is spelled *ú-ma-as-ta-ar-ba-ra-*, which can only reflect Iranian *\*vastrabara-*.<sup>81</sup> This makes the etymology and meaning of the word certain.

## 2. The Irano-Elamite Evidence

With the discovery that Babylonian *ustarbaru* is a rendering of *\*vastrabara-*, which developed to Old Persian *vaçabara-*, and the importance of the inscription DNd in this discovery, it is now possible to look for *ustarbaru* in Elamite sources. In fact, an Elamite calque on the Old Persian form immediately suggests itself: *lipte kuktir*: PN *lipte kuktira Tariyamauš sunki apte marriš* “PN, the *lipte kuktir*, holds Darius the king’s bow-and-arrow case.”<sup>82</sup>

*Lipte kuktir*, whereby *kuktir* is a reduplicated form of *kutir*, consists of *lipte* and *kutir*, a participial form of the verb *kuti-* “to carry, bear.” The meaning of *lipte* was originally thought to be “bow” or “battle-ax,” because of the fact that Aspācānah- is pictured holding a ceremonial ax or hammer.<sup>83</sup>

Weissbach refers to the occurrences of this word in the Neo-Elamite Acropole texts from Susa, where the word is attested three times (MDP 9 73: 1, 175: rev. 4, 264: 5).<sup>84</sup> A closer look at these texts,<sup>85</sup> where *lipte* is associated with textiles, induced F. Bork to assume a meaning “garment, blanket.”<sup>86</sup> This proposal was confirmed by R. Borger, who clearly

<sup>75</sup> Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen*, pp. 95–104.

<sup>76</sup> Walther Hinz, apud Rykle Borger, “Die Waffenträger des Königs Darius,” *Vetus Testamentum* 22 (1972): 390–91; idem, *Neue Wege im Altpersischen*, Göttinger Orientforschungen, Reihe 3, Iranica 1 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1973), pp. 57–58.

<sup>77</sup> Hinz, *Altiranisches Sprachgut*, p. 258; Joannès and Lemaire, “Contrats babyloniens,” p. 49 n. a; Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” p. 118; Tavernier, *Iranica*, p. 434 no. 4.4.7.121; Jursa, “Höflinge,” p. 168.

<sup>78</sup> The Elamite equivalent is *lipte kuktir*, the Babylonian one is restored *ša [šu-ba]-ta* (see Borger, “Die Waffenträger,” p. 391).

<sup>79</sup> This solution brings to an end the discussion on the origin and meaning of Old Persian *vaça-* and *vaçabara-*. *Vaçabara-* (and, in a derived way, *vaça-*) has been read (e.g., *manθrabara-* and *vursabara-*) and translated in various ways: “chamberlain” (Norris, “Memoir on the Scythic Version,” p. 432), “porteur des ordres,” (Jules Oppert, *Le peuple et la langue des Mèdes* [Paris: Maisonneuve, 1879], p. 206), “Genosse” (Friedrich Spiegel, *Die altpersischen Keilinschriften: Im Grundtexte mit Uebersetzung, Grammatik und Glossar*, 2nd ed. [Leipzig: Engelmann, 1881], p. 59; Franz H. Weissbach and Willy Bang, *Die altpersischen Keilinschriften in Umschrift und Übersetzung*, Assyriologische Bibliothek 10 [Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1893–1908], p. 37), “Stabträger” (Ferdinand Justi, “Der Chiliarch des Dareios,” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 50 [1896]: 663), “shield” (Artur F. Hoffmann-Kutschke, “Zu den Achämeniden-Inschriften,” *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 9 [1906]: 484) and “battle-axe” (Herbert C. Tolman, *Ancient Persian Lexikon*, Vanderbilt Oriental Series 6 [Nashville: Vanderbilt University, 1908], pp. 42 and 47; Franz H. Weissbach, *Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden*, Vorderasiatische Bibliothek 3 [Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911], p. 97; Walther Hinz, *Altpersischer Wortschatz*, Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 27/1 [Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1942], p. 144; Albert T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948], p. 218). Ilya Gershevitch, “Outdoor Terms in Iranian,” in *A Locust’s Leg: Studies in Honour of S. H. Taqizadeh*, edited by Walter B. Henning

and Ehsan Yarshater (London: Percy Lund, Humphries & Co., 1962), p. 78 n. 8, believes that it is a formation from a stem *\*vaθar-*. The latter would be related to *\*vaθa-* (cf. Avestan *vadar-* / *vada-*). Such a stem *\*vaθa-*, Avestan *\*vasa-* is clearly connected with Old Indian *vāṣi-* and Ossetian *uās* “ax.” See also Wilhelm Brandenstein and Manfred Mayrhofer, *Handbuch des Altpersischen* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1964), p. 150 (from Aryan *\*vašr-*, Old Indian *vāṣi-*, Ossetian *vās*). According to Roland G. Kent, “The Name of Hystaspes,” *Language* 21 [1945]: 233; idem, *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexikon*, American Oriental Series 33, 2nd rev. ed. [New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1953], p. 206) its meaning is “bow,” because of Aspathines’ holding of a bow on the accompanying relief.

<sup>80</sup> The cluster *-str-* thus had a development *-str- > -sç- > -ç-*, whereas *-štr-* developed to *-sç-* and finally to *-š-* (Beekes, apud Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” p. 118 n. 14).

<sup>81</sup> See Wilhelm Eilers, review of *Neubabylonische Rechts- und Verwaltungstexte*, by Oluf Krückmann, *Archiv für Orientforschung* 9 (1933–1934): 334 n. 13, and Zadok, review of Hinz, *Altiranisches Sprachgut*, p. 216, for the equation of Iranian */va/-* and Babylonian *<V-ma>*.

<sup>82</sup> Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” p. 117.

<sup>83</sup> Willy Foy, “Zur altpersischen Inschrift NR d,” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 55 (1901): 514; Weissbach, *Keilinschriften*, p. 97; Kent, “The Name of Hystaspes,” p. 233; Gershevitch, “Outdoor Terms,” pp. 78–79 and n. 8; Wilhelm Eilers, “Vier Bronze- waffen mit Keilinschriften aus West-Iran,” *Persica* 4 (1969): 29–31; Richard T. Hallock, *Persepolis Fortification Tablets*, Oriental Institute Publications 92 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), p. 721.

<sup>84</sup> Weissbach, *Keilinschriften*, p. 160.

<sup>85</sup> Vincent Scheil, *Textes Élamites - Anzanites* 3, *Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse* 9 (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1907), p. 66, translates his false reading *lu-ip-te* with “lainage.” In MDP 9 175 a list of garments (*kuk-tum*, *tukli*, etc.) is followed by *pap 59 li-ip-te* “In total: 59 garments.”

<sup>86</sup> Ferdinand Bork, review of *Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden*, by F. H. Weissbach, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 15 (1912): 68.



2.1.4. PFNN 1848<sup>98</sup>

In PFNN 1848 a group of thirty-five *lipte kuktira* (sg.) is mentioned (line 8). Each one receives one quart of flour a day. It is noteworthy that they are described as “keepers of the *šumar*” (*akkaṣ šumar niškip*). The word *šumar* probably refers to a tomb or burial mound. In the case of PFNN 1848 it most likely refers to a royal tomb.<sup>99</sup>

### 3. Functions of the *ustarbaru* and the *lipte kutip*

#### 3.1. Combination with Other Functions

The title *ustarbaru* or *lipte ku(k)tir* could be combined with other functions and/or titles, although this is relatively rare. Nonetheless, this does not imply that the combination of the title *ustarbaru* and another office appellative was unusual. Only five examples are known.

1. *mār bīti* (*ša Zātame*, a Persian nobleman): Ninakku<sup>100</sup>
2. *ša rēš šarri* “court-official”: Bagazuštu
3. *šaknu ša banaikānu* “foreman of the *banikānu*”: Bēl-bullissu
4. *Aspacānah-* (DND), who was the chief administrator in Persepolis
5. \*Daiθaka- (PF 1256), who performed other duties and was possibly called \**bājikara-*
6. a group of *lipte kutip* is called “the guards of the royal tomb” (*lipte kutip akkaṣ šumar niškip*)

In addition to this, *ustarbaru* itself may also be specified.

1. *ustarbaru ša Puršātu* (Parysatis): Siamû
2. *ustarbaru ša šarri*: Bēl-ittannu (no. 1.1.11), Šibbû, Linûḫ-libbi-ilī, Marduk (he is also a mere *ustarbaru* in other texts), and Paṭani’ešī

*Ustarbaru* could thus be connected to one individual (Parysatis). Possibly an *ustarbaru ša šarri* had more prestige than a mere *ustarbaru*.

#### 3.2. The Relation between *ustarbaru* and the Royal Family

The *ustarbaru* did obviously not belong to the royal family, but at minimum they had strong connections to it.<sup>101</sup> The officials could manage royal land (e.g., the Queen’s Estate; BE 9 28 and 50) or they could lease land to high officials (RA 90 48–49 no. 6). Pitibirī was granted a plot of land by the Achaemenid prince Siṭunu and Tiriadatu received a house from the king. It is not surprising to see that three of the five *ustarbaru* connected to the royal house have Iranian names (Bagamiḫî, Bagazuštu, and Tiriadatu). The others have an Egyptian (Pitibirī) and a Babylonian (Zababa-iddin) anthroponym.

The *ustarbaru* or their subordinates also witnessed contracts dealing with members of the Persian royalty or their subordinates.<sup>102</sup> It is needless to say that not all records of business between the Murašû firm and the Achaemenids were witnessed by *ustarbaru*.

1. Aššur-aḫ-iddin and Nabû-nadin, two agents of Bēl-ibukaš (no. 1.1.8), witness a contract between Qûsu-Iâḫabi and Enlil-supē-muḫur, the bailiff of Prince Aršam (BE 9 1).
2. Kiribti-Bēl (no. 1.1.16) witnesses a contract between Labaši, the bailiff of prince Dundana, and Rīmût-Ninurta, a member of the Murašû family (BE 10 89).<sup>103</sup>

Finally, the contacts between the *ustarbaru* and the royal family also were visible in death. In the Persepolis Fortification texts the guards of royal tombs could have the title of *ustarbaru*.

<sup>98</sup> For a commented edition of this text based on Hallock’s notes, see Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” pp. 107–10.

<sup>99</sup> A thorough study of the expression *šumar* can be found in Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial.”

<sup>100</sup> See Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen*, p. 88; Zadok, “Iranians and Individuals,” pp. 102 and 111; Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, p. 106; and Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” p. 163.

<sup>101</sup> Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” p. 122.

<sup>102</sup> Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” p. 163.

<sup>103</sup> Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire*, p. 66.

### 3.3. Ustarbarus as Masters or Owners of Other Persons

An indication of a higher status of the officials discussed here is the appearance in documents of their subordinates. These people, who worked for an *ustarbaru*, leased out land owned or managed by their master (TuM 2/3 148), managed land owned by the *ustarbaru* (e.g., PBS 2/1 70, 98), received rent for such land (BE 9 28, 50; BE 10 103, 114, 129; PBS 2/1 43, 70, 98, 102), or made payments on behalf of the *ustarbaru* (HSM 8414). The direct involvement of the *ustarbaru* is less frequent (AIONS 77 1; BE 9 102; Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen*, pl. 3; PBS 2/1 65; RA 90 48–49 no. 6).

It seems that the bailiffs (*paqdu*) had the highest responsibility of all subordinates. They managed properties, which they could lease out.<sup>104</sup> There are only two activities that could also be conducted by other subordinates: the receiving of rent and the witnessing of contracts. The first one was the competence of bailiffs,<sup>105</sup> deputies,<sup>106</sup> agents,<sup>107</sup> and servants,<sup>108</sup> but bailiffs are still involved in the majority of texts. Only servants<sup>109</sup> and agents<sup>110</sup> witnessed contracts. In other Murašû texts bailiffs too could be witnesses.<sup>111</sup>

This pattern seems to be only partly corroborated by the other Murašû texts: there the competence of servants (*ardu*) is much greater, since they also make payments,<sup>112</sup> lease out land,<sup>113</sup> lease land,<sup>114</sup> but their main function remains the receiving of rent.<sup>115</sup> In one case (IMT 105), a servant starts litigation. This suggests that the common translation of “servant” is misleading.

In general, the responsibility of the agents (*mār bīti*) and the bailiffs (*paqdu*) was not simply to receive rent.<sup>116</sup> Agents also lease and lease out,<sup>117</sup> make payments,<sup>118</sup> appear as creditors,<sup>119</sup> or do other things.<sup>120</sup> The name of only one agent is known: Iranian \*Tīrīkāma- “having a desire for Tirya.”<sup>121</sup> This person had an authority approaching that of the family members themselves:<sup>122</sup> he made payments for the firm (BE 10 56), he leased out land (IMT 22) or a building (BE 9 54), he appears as creditor<sup>123</sup> (BE 9 68; EE 86), receives land to work on (PBS 2/1 159), and is attested conducting other business (BE 10 10; EE 93, 94; PBS 2/1 28).

Bailiffs were especially engaged in the managing of land.<sup>124</sup> All this may lead one to see some hierarchy in the various titles, although it is equally possible that the titles do not have a hierarchical connotation. The social status of the subordinates (free or unfree) will not be discussed here.<sup>125</sup>

The attested subordinates of *ustarbaru* are:

1. agents (*mār bīti*): Bēl-nadin, agent of Bagamiḥi (1.1.2)
2. commissioned agents (*ālik našparti*): no individual is named (cf. n. 2)
3. associate (*aḥu*):<sup>126</sup> Ḥašdaya, associate of Bēl-īdiš (1.1.9)
4. deputy (*šanû*): Ḥurru, deputy of Zababa-iddin (1.1.31)

<sup>104</sup> This authority is also attested for bailiffs of other officials.

<sup>105</sup> BE 10 103, 114, 129; PBS 2/1 43, 70, 102.

<sup>106</sup> BE 9 28.

<sup>107</sup> BE 9 50.

<sup>108</sup> PBS 2/1 43, 98.

<sup>109</sup> BE 10 129; Fs Perrot 173 no. 1; TuM 2/3 148.

<sup>110</sup> BE 9 1.

<sup>111</sup> E.g., (1) PBS 2/1 27, 129, and 193 (Nidintu-šamaš / Kartakku, *paqdu* and *ardu* of Artahšari); (2) TuM 2/3 147 (Mitradatu, *paqdu* of Dadaršu); (3) TuM 2/3 184 (Pe-e-Ē-ku-uš, *paqdu* of Amurru-iddin).

<sup>112</sup> E.g., BE 8/1 126; BE 10 126; IMT 100; TuM 2/3 189.

<sup>113</sup> E.g., BE 10 99.

<sup>114</sup> E.g., BE 9 54, 60; EE 99; IMT 13, 33; PBS 2/1 215. In most cases they leased the land from their master, e.g., BE 9 26, 29, 30, 51, 65, 86a, 99; BE 10 54; EE 17, 28, 30; IMT 10, 16, 18; PBS 2/1 106, 115. Other contracts between an official and his subordinate are BE 9 21, 51; IMT 96; PBS 2/1 111, 127, 222; and TuM 2/3 203.

<sup>115</sup> E.g., BE 9 11, 73, 75, 83–84; BE 10 56, 58, 76, 80, 88, 117; EE 34, 59; IMT 53, 55; PBS 2/1 60, 133.

<sup>116</sup> *Mār bīti*: BE 9 14, 15, 59; IMT 40, 45; PBS 2/1 125. *Paqdu*: BE 9 39; BE 10 89, 127; IMT 38.

<sup>117</sup> E.g., IMT 20; PBS 2/1 15, 159.

<sup>118</sup> E.g., BE 10 56.

<sup>119</sup> E.g., BE 9 68.

<sup>120</sup> E.g., BE 10 10; IMT 20; PBS 2/1 15, 28.

<sup>121</sup> Attested in texts dating from 428 (Artaxerxes 37) to 423 (Darius 1). It is interesting to see that the oldest attestation (EE 94) describes him as *ardu* “servant,” while the other eleven texts (Anatolica 14 127 no. 67; BE 9 54, 68; BE 10 10, 56; EE 86, 93; IMT 20, 22; PBS 2/1 11, 28) call him *mār bīti* “agent.” This could give us a hint about the career of \*Tīrīkāma-.

For the name, see Hinz, *Altiranisches Sprachgut*, p. 237; Zadok, “Iranians and Individuals,” p. 102; Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, p. 125; Tavernier, *Iranica*, pp. 326–27 no. 4.2.1710.

<sup>122</sup> Cardascia, *Les archives des Murašû*, pp. 12 and 29 n. 2; Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire*, p. 21.

<sup>123</sup> The only other subordinate of the Murašû firm who appears as creditor is Ribat, an *ardu*, who also held a high position within the firm.

<sup>124</sup> E.g., BE 9 1, 39; BE 10 89, 127, 130–32; EE 4; IMT 38; PBS 2/1 145.

<sup>125</sup> For a study of this status, see Muhammad A. Dandamayev, *Slavery in Babylonia: From Nabopolassar to Alexander the Great (626–331 B.C.)*, edited by Marvin A. Powell and David B. Weisberg, translated by Victoria A. Powell (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1984), pp. 83–89 and 99–101.

<sup>126</sup> *Aḥu* has a general sense and can mean “assistant, colleague, associate” (Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire*, p. 20).

5. bailiff (*paqdu*)
  - Barikia / Isparda, bailiff of Parnuš (1.1.22)
  - Bēl-aḥ-ušabši, bailiff of Pitibiri (1.1.24)
  - Bēl-ibni, bailiff of Šibbû (1.1.28)
  - Paruhātu, bailiff of Ipraduparnâ (1.1.15)
6. servants (*ardu*)
  - Bēl-ibni, servant of Parnuš (1.1.22)
  - Kišā, servant of Šibbû (1.1.28)
  - Pani'esī, servant of Pitibiri (1.1.24)
  - six servants of Šamû (1.1.27; four with name preserved)
7. slaves (*amēlūtu*): four of them sold by Bēl-ittannu (1.1.11) for 5 minas of silver

Two texts indicate that some *ustarbaru*s had many subordinates. In BE 10 9 the agents, commissioned agents, and servants of Bagadata are mentioned and in Fs Perrot 173 no. 1 at least six servants of Šamû appear in a marriage contract between two servants. The *ustarbaru*s could, just like other free citizens, sell or buy slaves. In PBS 2/1 65 Bēl-ittannu sells four slaves for 5 minas of silver.

One Elamite text (PF 1256) mentions three servants of \*Daiṭaka- the *ustarbaru* (here: *lipte kutir*), who receive one quart of flour a day, that is, half of the rations their master receives.

### 3.4. *Ustarbaru*s as Owners and/or Managers of Land, Houses, and Canals

*Ustarbaru*s could possess plots of lands,<sup>127</sup> which they rented out. A good example of this is Parnuš, who owned at least two plots of land, which were managed by two of his subordinates (BE 10 103; PBS 2/1 70, 98, 102). Yearly he received 30 kur of barley for one plot and 12 shekels of silver for the other plot.

The immovable property owned by them could have been a royal grant (in the case of Tiriadatu [Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen*, pl. 3]) or a grant by a prince (e.g., Siṭunu, who gives land to Pitibiri [BE 10 129; TuM 2/3 148]). Possibly other royal grants were given to Bagadata (BE 10 9) and Bagapāta (HSM 8414).<sup>128</sup> In some cases there is no information available about the property of the *ustarbaru*: Ipraduparna (BE 10 114) and Šibbû (PBS 2/1 43; rent of 1/2 mina).<sup>129</sup> This, however, does not exclude that these properties were also royal grants.

The case of Siṭunu is particularly interesting.<sup>130</sup> The two relevant texts are witnessed by Bābu-iddin, who in one text is called “bailiff of the estate of Siṭunu, which has been given to Pitibiri” (TuM 2/3 148).<sup>131</sup> In all likelihood Pitibiri belonged to the retinue of Siṭunu and as such was granted property from the prince, although it is not impossible that Siṭunu died (or lost the king's favor) after which the land came into Pitibiri's hands. Consequently, both persons were proprietors.<sup>132</sup>

In other cases *ustarbaru*s only managed land owned by other people. In BE 9 28 and 50 (respectively from 429 and 434) two *ustarbaru*s are presented as managers of the so-called queen's estate. Part of the rent paid by the Murašu firm consists of rations for the *ustarbaru* and his subordinates.<sup>133</sup> Accordingly, these managers and their subordinates who were also occupied with the management of land had to draw their supplies from the rent they received for lands belonging to the estate itself.<sup>134</sup>

Another estate connected with *ustarbaru*s is the crown prince's estate (*bīt umasupitrû*).<sup>135</sup> In BE 10 15 Bēl-īdišu, the associate of Labaši, the *šaknu* of the crown prince's estate, turns over some bow lands, belonging to this estate, to Enlil-šum-iddin. Two royal *ustarbaru*s (Paṭani'esī and Marduk) are witnesses.

PBS 2/1 38 bears the seal impression of Siamû, the *ustarbaru* ša Puršātu (Parysatis). Probably he was the manager of an estate of this queen, but this is not fully certain.<sup>136</sup>

<sup>127</sup> Matthew W. Stolper, “Iranians in Babylonia,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114 (1994): 622.

<sup>128</sup> Stolper, “Iranians in Babylonia,” p. 622; Joannès and Lemaire, “Contrats babyloniens,” p. 54 n. 24.

<sup>129</sup> This plot of land cannot be connected to one of the plots of Parnuš, which would have enhanced the possible familial relation between these two *ustarbaru*s.

<sup>130</sup> Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire*, p. 67.

<sup>131</sup> In BE 10 129 he is simply called “bailiff of Pitibiri.” This is probably an abbreviation (Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire*, p. 67 n. 78).

<sup>132</sup> Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire*, p. 67.

<sup>133</sup> Rations for *ustarbaru*s are also attested in the Persepolis Fortification archive.

<sup>134</sup> Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire*, pp. 63 and 67.

<sup>135</sup> Iranian \*Vāsapuθrava-, an adjectival derivation from \*vās(a) puθra- “crown prince” (Karl Butz, review of *Management and Politics in Later Achaemenid Babylonia*, by Matthew W. Stolper, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 68 [1976]: 200; Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire*, p. 60; Tavernier, *Iranica*, p. 434 no. 4.4.7.120).

<sup>136</sup> Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” p. 163.

In BE 9 102 the land is a “royal grant,” but not to the *ustarbar* Bēl-bullissu, as some authors believe.<sup>137</sup> It is much more likely that Bēl-bullissu represented the *ḫaṭru* of the *banaikānu*, whose foreman he was. Consequently, the land was property of the *ḫaṭru* and as representative of it Bēl-bullissu could lease out the land of the feudatories of the *ḫaṭru*.<sup>138</sup>

Possibly some *ustarbarus* were fiefholders on the estates they managed. The rent paid to the two managers of the queen’s estate, for instance, included rations for these managers (explicitly in BE 9 50, where part of the rent paid by Enlil-šum-iddin is 15 kur of barley for Bagamiḫī). This means that they may have possessed a part of the estate and that as a consequence they were fiefholders on the estate.<sup>139</sup>

Henkelman suggests that this is also the case concerning Pitibirī, who was given a plot of land by Siṭunu. An important difference is that Pitibirī was the owner of the land, which automatically means he was a fiefholder. Henkelman’s hypothesis is only valid for people who manage another person’s land.<sup>140</sup>

The reasons why these people leased out land of their own is not fully clear. Several possibilities arise:<sup>141</sup>

1. The lessor did not live close to his property, for example, Bagazuštu.
2. The lessor did not have sufficient means to maintain the management and exploitation of his land, so he leased it out to gain more profit (e.g., BE 9 102).

It should be emphasized that land management of this sort does not apply to *ustarbarus* alone.<sup>142</sup>

Finally, *ustarbarus* could also be organized in a *ḫaṭru*-institution.<sup>143</sup> This is shown by the occurrence of a *ḫaṭru* ša <sup>140</sup>*ustaribarra* (BE 10 32: 4). As seen above, the title of *ustarbar* could be cumulated with the foremanship of such a *ḫaṭru*.

In the Elamite Fortification texts \*Daiṭaka- (PF 1256) is called a “registrar.” This means that one of his duties was to make up registers of property.<sup>144</sup>

The text IMT 3 mentions a canal named after an *ustarbaru*, Enlil-šum-ibni. This could imply that at the time the text was written this person was leasing a stretch of a particular canal or that he owned (i.e., it was granted by the king or a royal official)<sup>145</sup> this stretch. He might also have been canal manager (ša ana muḫḫi sūti ša íd NN). Certainly the title of *ustarbar* on itself had nothing to do with canal management.

### 3.5. Other Business of the *ustarbarus*

Although the majority of the *ustarbarus* were engaged in land management, not all of them occur in texts related to that kind of business. They can be witnesses (cf. infra) or the title simply serves as an identification (Fs Perrot 173 no. 1, where Mannu-kî-Nanâ, a servant of Šamû, marries a slave woman of Kinûnaia, another servant of Šamû). In AIONS 77 1 Bēlšunu deposits 1,5 talents of silver.

The most interesting document in this regard is IMT 105, in which Bēl-ittannu / Bēl-uballiṭ appears as member of a panel of free citizens judging in a case between Šiṭāʾ, servant of Prince Aršam, and Enlil-šum-iddin, member of the Murašû family. Here an *ustarbaru* has clearly some juridical influence, albeit seemingly only as member of the panel, rather than as *ustarbaru*. Other texts might indeed point to such a competence. If the named Bēl-ibukaš, a judge in ROMCT 2 35, is the same individual as Bēl-ibukaš the *ustarbaru* (1.1.8), then the connection between *ustarbar* and legal authority is directly attested. He and two other judges are explicitly listed before the witnesses, as if they have to guard the contract. As a matter of fact *ustarbarus* also appear in this position (AIONS 77 1: ina IGI <sup>m</sup>Man-nu-ki-ia LÚ us-tar-bar-ri).

In BE 10 15 two royal *ustarbarus* are also named together with a judge. In BE 10 91 Linūḫ-libbi-ilī is the first witness, appearing after Bēl-zēr-iddin, a judge of whom it is explicitly said that he was present. This evidence, however, is at most supportive for an assumption of juridical power of *ustarbarus*.

To summarize, competence in jurisdiction is attested in connection with *ustarbarus*, but this competence was probably not acquired through their title of *ustarbar*.

<sup>137</sup> Joannès and Lemaire, “Contrats babyloniens,” p. 54 n. 24; Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” p. 163.

<sup>138</sup> Cardascia, *Les archives des Murašû*, p. 128 and n. 1; Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire*, p. 127.

<sup>139</sup> Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire*, p. 63; Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” p. 163.

<sup>140</sup> The bailiff of Parysatis had a fief on her estate (Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire*, p. 65).

<sup>141</sup> Joannès and Lemaire, “Contrats babyloniens,” p. 54.

<sup>142</sup> Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire*, pp. 65 and 67; Joannès and Lemaire, “Contrats babyloniens,” pp. 54–56.

<sup>143</sup> Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire*, p. 78; Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” p. 163.

<sup>144</sup> Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” p. 164.

<sup>145</sup> Most canals were property of the king (Stolper, *Entrepreneurs and Empire*, pp. 37–38).

### 3.6. *Ustarbarus* as Witnesses

Mostly the *ustarbaru* appear as witnesses. Yet they seem to be rather important witnesses. This is proven by their occasional attestation before the actual list of witnesses (“in the presence of PN”). In the majority of texts the *ustarbaru* is the first or second witness. Mostly their patronymic is not mentioned, but apparently that was not necessary, since their title in itself was already identification for the readers of the tablets.

One time an *ustarbaru* is the fifth witness (Bēl-ittannu / Bēl-uballit) or the sixth (Kiribtī-Bēl). There they are named with title and patronymic. As a counter-example of this tendency, Nanā-iddin is in BE 10 102 the last witness, without patronymic.

In some texts two or more *ustarbarus* appear as witness:<sup>146</sup>

1. Bēl-ittannu and Marduk: PBS 2/1 104 (13 Aug 417)
2. Bēl-ittannu and Nanā-iddin: TuM 2/3 204 (28 Aug 419)
3. Bēl-ittannu, Bēl-tattannu-bullissu and Šum-ušur: RA 86 75 (18 Feb 417)
4. Bēl-ittannu, Marduk and Bēl-tattannu-bulissu: PBS 2/1 126 (10 Feb 417)
5. Marduk and Paṭani'esī, both royal *ustarbarus*: BE 10 15 (18 May 423)

It also happens that *ustarbaru* witness contracts between a colleague (or one of his subordinates) and another party:

1. In BE 9 102 Bēl-bulissu is a party, while his colleague Bēl-ēṭir is the first witness (sealing)
2. Nanā-iddin witnesses a contract (BE 10 103) in which a subordinate of Parnuš is one of the parties
3. Bēl-tabtannu-bulissu is witness when an associate of Bēl-īdiš leases some land (PBS 2/1 96)
4. When Bēlšunu deposited 1,5 talents of silver, his action was witnessed by his colleague Mannukia

Finally, it should be mentioned that *ustarbarus* or their subordinates also witness contracts dealing with members of the Persian royalty or their subordinates, as already explained above.

## 4. Insignia of *ustarbarus*?

The weapon (a sort of hammer) held by Aspācānah- on the relief at Naqš-e Rostam is not referred to in any of his titles (“garment-bearer” and “holder of the king’s bow-and-arrow case”).<sup>147</sup> Therefore it is believed by Henkelman to be the “insignium of Aspathines’ office, that of ‘chancellor of the king’s house’ and chief administrator of the Persepolis economic system.”<sup>148</sup> Henkelman cites various Old and Middle Elamite axes and seals as parallels for such insignia. Yet most of these objects have an uncertain nature and could be votive objects. This is the case for the ax inscribed with the name of Attahušu,<sup>149</sup> the ax with an inscription of Untaš-Napiriša,<sup>150</sup> the ax with an inscription of Šilhak-Inšušinak,<sup>151</sup> and the uninscribed ax dating from the end of the second millennium B.C.<sup>152</sup>

Two other objects could be insignia, but that depends on how their inscriptions are translated.<sup>153</sup> The first one<sup>154</sup> is an ax with an inscription At-tá-hu-šu ... Ib-ni-Adad ñr-zu ha-ši-[ud-k]a-[bar] in-na-ba, which can be translated in two ways: (1) “Attahušu (*titulature*): Ibni-Adad, his servant, presented him with this (bronze) axe” (Sollberger), or (2) “Attahušu (*titulature*) has made and given this (bronze) axe to Ibni-Adad, his servant” (Lambert). Lambert connects in-na-ba with the various Ur III seals containing this expression and which he considers to be gifts from kings to their top officials.<sup>155</sup>

The second object is a tankard inscribed with the following text: At-tá-hu-šu ... Ib-ni-Adad egir te-ep-pí-ir ñr-zu gu-na-gi<sub>4</sub> zabar in-na-dím in-na-sum. This text too can be translated in two ways: (1) “Attahušu (*titulature*): Ibni-Adad, the assistant scribe, his servant, made for him and gave him (this) bronze *gunagi*-tankard” (Sollberger), or (2) “Attahušu (*titulature*): to Ibni-Adad, the assistant scribe, his servant, he made and gave (this) bronze *gunagi*-tankard” (Lambert).

<sup>146</sup> Stolper, “Murašû Texts from Susa,” pp. 71 and 75; Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” p. 163.

<sup>147</sup> For an image of this ceremonial weapon, see Erich F. Schmidt, *Persepolis 1: Structures, Reliefs, Inscriptions*, Oriental Institute Publications 68 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), pl. 121.

<sup>148</sup> Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” pp. 124–26.

<sup>149</sup> Pierre Amiet, *Élam* (Auvers-sur-Oise: Archée, 1966), p. 259 no. 188.

<sup>150</sup> Amiet, *Élam*, p. 358 no. 265.

<sup>151</sup> Georges Dossin, “Bronzes inscrits du Luristan de la collection Foroughi,” *Iranica Antiqua* 2 (1962), p. 157 no. 13; Amiet, *Élam*, p. 406 no. 306.

<sup>152</sup> Amiet, *Élam*, p. 407 no. 307.

<sup>153</sup> Edmond Sollberger, “A Tankard for Atta-hušu,” *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 22 (1968): 30–31; Maurice Lambert, “Investiture de fonctionnaires en Élam,” *Journal Asiatique* 259 (1971): 217.

<sup>154</sup> Dossin, “Bronzes inscrits,” p. 157, reads the name as E-a-ni-e-em.

<sup>155</sup> See also Vincent Scheil, “Passim,” *Revue d’Assyriologie et d’archéologie orientale* 25 (1925): 147–49.

If Lambert's translations are corrent, then the two objects may very well be insignia of high-ranking officials. Another parallel is presented by the axes held by some officials at the Qajar court (e.g., under Fath-Ali Shah, 1797–1834), when the *nasaqči bāši* “chief-discipliner” had such axes. According to Henkelman these insignia are indications of a traditional relation between ceremonial battle-axes and the office of royal chancellor.

Two seals are also of interest to this discussion. They both depict the same scene: the handing of an ax likely of the same type of those discussed above by one person to another. Both seals have an inscription. The first one<sup>156</sup> has “Imazu, son of Kintattu, king of Anšan,” whereas the inscription of the second one is much more informative and actually belongs to the *innaba*-type: I-da-du en<sub>5</sub>-si Šušin<sup>ki</sup> ìr ki-ág<sup>d</sup> Inšušnak dumu Tan-<sup>d</sup>Ru-hu-ra-ti-ir Ku-uk-Si-mu-ut *te-ep-pi-ir* ìr ki-ág-a-ni in-na-ba “Itatu, prince of Susa, beloved servant of Inšušinak, has presented (this seal) to Kuk-Simut, the *teppir*, his beloved servant.”<sup>157</sup> The officials received the seal and probably also a battle-ax.

Finally, there is a nice seventh-century parallel to the Naqš-e Rostam relief.<sup>158</sup> The Neo-Elamite relief of Kūl-e Farah I has an image of Hanni, a local ruler of Ayapir, accompanied by two officials.<sup>159</sup> Just like Aspacānah- in Naqš-e Rostam, one of the officials is carrying a quiver and a short sword. He is presented as “Šutruru, the *ragipal* of Hanni” (EKI 75B: ú<sup>m</sup>Šu-ut<sup>l</sup>-ru-ru [r]a-g[i]-pal<sup>m</sup>Ha-an-ni). The title *ragipal* is in all likelihood a derivation of Akkadian *rab ekalli* “master of the palace,”<sup>160</sup> although that is not yet completely corroborated.<sup>161</sup> The weapons he carries are in all likelihood insignia of his office. It is equally likely that Šutruru and Aspacānah- had comparable functions at their respective courts (chief administrator, chancellor of the royal house). As a consequence, Aspacānah- must have had a third title, not mentioned on the relief, but designating his function as “royal chamberlain.” Whether he bore the title *rab ekalli* for this office cannot be confirmed.

The *rab ekalli*, first attested in twelfth-century Assyria, was a key figure in the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian administration. He is, however, more frequently attested in the Neo-Assyrian empire and was actually the head of the palace administration. In that function he was responsible for the internal organization of the palace: making sure that the palace workers did their jobs, that the cattle and the birds belonging to the palace were being fed, etc.

Each palace (there are six known palaces in Kalhu, for example) had its *rab ekalli*, so that this office could be held by various persons simultaneously. This emerges from especially Neo-Assyrian texts, where sometimes two or three different *rab ekallis* are mentioned together (e.g., in ADD 640–641 or ND 2314 [cf. *Iraq* 16: 40]). In other cases the texts specify the palace or city to which the *rab ekalli* belongs, for example, “the palace manager of the Review Palace at Kalhu” (*rab ekalli ša ekal māšarte ša Kalhu*: CTN 3 10: 4–5 and 12: 2–3 [Neo-Assyrian]) or “the palace manager of Borsippa” (*rab ekalli ša Barsip*: TCL 13 153: 6–7 [527 B.C.]).<sup>162</sup>

From Mesopotamia the office and the title were introduced into Elam, where it appears in texts from the Late Neo-Elamite period, ca. 640–550 B.C. Twice a *rab ekalli* is mentioned in the Niniveh Letters (nos. 3: 6 [<sup>be</sup>gal e.gal<sup>meš</sup>] and 5: 4 [<sup>gal</sup><sup>meš</sup> aš<sup>e</sup>-kál-li]), unfortunately without clear contexts. Scholars assume that in Nin. 5 the “master of the palace” is mentioned together with the place names Ayapir and Katmurti, while in the preceding line Zamin of Hatamti is mentioned.<sup>163</sup> Nevertheless, the *rab ekalli* and the name Ayapir (which is a personal name, as indicated by the determinative HAL) are connected in a coordinative way: “The *rab ekalli* and Ayapir from Katmurti.”<sup>164</sup>

In the Acropole Texts from Susa three *rab ekallis* are attested: Humpan-haltaš (MDP 9 9: 2, 93: 14, 163: 4–5, 232: 2), Humpan-tuniš (MDP 9 39: 7), and Harina (MDP 9 145: 8). An unnamed one occurs in MDP 9 22: 1.<sup>165</sup> Finally, the *rab ekalli* of King Humpan-šutruk, Nappahpi, appears in the Ururu Bronze Tablet.

<sup>156</sup> Amiet, *Élam*, p. 257 no. 186.

<sup>157</sup> Lambert, “Investiture,” p. 219.

<sup>158</sup> On other parallels between the Neo-Elamite reliefs of Kūl-e Farah and Šekaft-e Salmān, on the one hand, and the Achaemenid tomb reliefs, on the other hand, see Peter Calmeyer, “Zur Genese altiranischer Motive,” *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran* 6 (1973): 140–52; idem, “The Subject of the Achaemenid Tomb Reliefs,” in *Proceedings of the IIIrd Annual Symposium on Archaeological Research in Iran*, edited by Firouz Bagherzadeh (Tehran: Iranian Centre for Archaeological Research, 1975), pp. 233–42.

<sup>159</sup> Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” pp. 127–28.

<sup>160</sup> Walther Hinz, “Elamisches,” *Archiv Orientalní* 18 (1950): 297 n. 13; Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” p. 128.

<sup>161</sup> Matthew W. Stolper, “Malāmīr. B. Philologisch,” *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 7 (1988): 277–78.

<sup>162</sup> Stephanie Dalley and J. Nicholas Postgate, *The Tablets from Fort Shalmaneser*, Cuneiform texts from Nimrud 3 (London: British School of Archaeology in Iraq, 1984), pp. 6–9; Marie-Joseph Steve, “La fin de

l'Élam: à propos d'une empreinte de sceau-cylindre,” *Studia Iranica* 15 (1986): 14; Nili Sacher Fox, *In the Service of the King: Officialdom in Ancient Israel and Judah*, Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 23 (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 2000), pp. 93–94; Muhammad A. Dandamayev, “Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid State Administration in Mesopotamia,” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, edited by Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006), p. 373.

<sup>163</sup> François Vallat, “Le royaume élamite de Zamin et les ‘Lettres de Ninive,’” *Iranica Antiqua* 33 (1998): 99–100; Matthew W. Waters, *A Survey of Neo-Elamite History*, State Archives of Assyria Studies 12 (Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2000), p. 92.

<sup>164</sup> See Hinz and Koch, *Elamisches Wörterbuch*, p. 15.

<sup>165</sup> The text citations are the ones where the title *rab ekalli* is mentioned. The names themselves (Humpan-haltaš, Humpan-tuniš, and Harina) occur elsewhere in the archive, but it is not certain if all these attestations refer to the same individuals.



The Elamite texts do not yield much information on the Elamite *rab ekalli*: in the Acropole Texts they appear as receivers of garments or bronze objects, Šutruru, the palace manager of Hanne (EKI 75–76), apparently advised his master on a statue.

It may be assumed that the royal court had one *rab ekalli*, who actually was the head of the administration. Some local rulers (e.g., Hanni) also could have a *rab ekalli*.

Henkelman believes that Šutruru and Aspacānah- held the same office and that accordingly the *vačabara-* (*ustarbaru*, *lipte kuktir*) and the *rab ekalli* were basically the same people, designated as “chamberlain, royal chancellor.” In the case of Aspacānah- this title is then the official indication of his high-ranked position (principal administrator). The difference in the attestations of both individuals is found at the level of their titles: Šutruru is mentioned with his professional title, whereas Aspacānah- is designated by his honorary title.<sup>166</sup>

It is certain that some of the objects fit in the pattern of investiture of officials and that they were thus insignia connected with the specific function and title of the officials. One should, however, be cautious. As Henkelman correctly implies, the persons who possessed the insignia (e.g., Šutruru and Aspacānah-) had (probably) more than one title: Aspacānah- is called both “garment-bearer” and “he who holds the king’s bow-and-arrow case” and probably also had a title *rab ekalli* or something indicating that he was the royal chancellor. The two first titles were court titles (cf. § 5.3) and it is to one of both titles that the insignia refer.

It is thus by no means proven that any of the insignia discussed above has anything to do with the appellative *ustarbaru*. The insignia may well be connected with a type of official, for example, the royal chancellor or the *teppir*, but never is there a certain direct relationship between insignia and the *ustarbaru* or *lipte kutir*.

Moreover, it is far from sure that the appellative *ustarbaru* / *lipte kuktir* refers to the royal chancellor, as Henkelman implies. While Aspacānah- was indeed a top official, there are attestations of many other *ustarbarus*, who were certainly not as high-ranked officials as Aspacānah-. In addition, some of them appear in a same time span as Aspacānah- (first years of Darius II). It is impossible that all of them were holding the same high-ranked function of royal chancellor. With regard to Šutruru it is not sure if he had a title *lipte kuktir* or something similar, since that title is never attested for this person. In short, royal chancellors could also be called *ustarbaru*, but not all people called *ustarbaru* were royal chancellor.

It may thus very well be that the objects held by Aspathines on the relief are the insignia of his real offices. Yet he may also have had a symbol attached to his title of *vačabara-*: his garment (Old Persian *vača-*). If the hammer refers to his chancellorship and the bow-and-arrow case to his title “holder of the king’s bow-and-arrow case,” the garment may as well refer to his *vačabaraship* and be thus the very symbol of this appellative. Garments could easily be given by the king to his supporters (cf. *infra*).

## 5. The *ustarbaru* in a Wider Context

### 5.1. Frequency and Social Position of the *ustarbaru*

The appellative *ustarbaru* is most often attested in texts dating from the reign of Darius II. Although the number of texts dating from the reign of Darius I is very high, only two named *ustarbarus* are attested in these texts:<sup>167</sup> (1) Aspacānah-, who is already discussed, and (2) Marḥarpu, an Egyptian who also took an Iranian name (\*Bagazušta-) and who is also called *ša rēš šarri* “royal commissioner.” The latter aspect corroborates his high position in the Achaemenid administration and society. If he is identical with \*Bagazušta- mentioned in Amherst 258, a list of various top officials, this would be a further confirmation of his high status.

Possibly the title became more frequently used after the second year of Xerxes, but this is difficult (impossible?) to judge due to the lower number of texts from his reign. More attestations occur in the Murašû texts (reigns of Artaxerxes I and Darius II), with a peak in the texts from the beginning of the reign of Darius II. An explanation for this phenomenon is given below (see below, § 5.2).

As already demonstrated, the *ustarbaru* held a high social position.<sup>168</sup> They were mostly high-ranking officials in the Achaemenid administration; indeed, it appears that the granting of the title *ustarbaru* only enhanced their already high position. They were land owners and had strong connections with the royal family; they also combined their title of *ustarbaru* with other offices and had many subordinates and may have possessed insignia.

<sup>166</sup> Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” pp. 118–29.

<sup>167</sup> Next to the *ustarbaru*, whose name is not preserved (no. 1.1.32).

<sup>168</sup> Against Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen*, p. 89), who uses the high frequency of the title as an argument in favor of a low social importance of the *ustarbaru*.

## 5.2. Ustarbaru and ša rēš šarri

In an interesting article, M. Jursa claims that the title *ustarbaru* is in fact the successor of the title *ša rēš šarri*.<sup>169</sup> Various aspects favor this hypothesis:

1. The title *ustarbaru* appears at the moment when the title *ša rēš šarri* begins to fall into disuse. During the Neo-Babylonian period and into the beginning of the Achaemenid period, that is, until the second year of Xerxes' reign<sup>170</sup> (484 B.C.) the title *ša rēš šarri* is amply attested, whereas from 484 on it is barely attested. Jursa lists only eight examples.<sup>171</sup>
2. Their function and role in the texts is similar: both official (in the civilian administration)<sup>172</sup> and non-official (e.g., as witness, house owners, etc.) functions are taken care of by these officials.
3. Their social position is similar: both the *ša rēš šarris* and the *ustarbarus* are high-ranking persons who have various subordinates at their disposal. The fact that not many patronymics are attested of these people supports this. Apparently the title guaranteed such an amount of prestige that it automatically identified the person who bore it.
4. The people holding these titles are ethnically diverse.
5. In some cases the title seems to have been hereditary.

A difference between the bearers of both titles is their military responsibility. While a *ša rēš šarri* could be a military commander, an *ustarbaru* apparently could not. This can partly be explained by the transition from the Neo-Babylonian to the Achaemenid empires, since the various *ša rēš šarris* with military responsibilities all figure in the Neo-Babylonian empire, which organized its military differently from the Achaemenid empire. However, as our knowledge of the military of these periods remains limited, one should be cautious about this.

Two times the same individual is both called (*ša*) *rēš šarri* and *ustarbaru*. In RA 90 48–49 no. 6 (from 496 B.C.) \*Bagazušta- (1.1.5) has both appellatives. Šamû is called *ša rēš šarri* in PBS 2/1 130 and *ustarbaru* in Fs Perrot nos. 1–2. According to Jursa this text demonstrates that the titles were not always synonymous. He explains this anomaly by suggesting that the title *ustarbaru* was semantically expanded and could be used for any former *ša rēš šarri*.<sup>173</sup> Alternatively, these texts may be situated in a transition period during which the title *ustarbaru* was used as synonym for *ša rēš šarri*.<sup>174</sup> This is certainly valid for the text of 496 B.C., when the expression *ustarbaru* was not yet fully integrated.

## 5.3. Ustarbarus as Collaborators<sup>175</sup> with the Achaemenid Administration

One of the aspects of royal Achaemenid ideology is loyalty to the king and royal recompensations for this loyalty.<sup>176</sup> It was indeed a royal duty to promote the people who had been of assistance to the king. The Achaemenid royal inscriptions at Bīsītūn and Naqš-e Rostam are explicit: “The man who strove for my (royal) house, him I treated well” (DB iv 63), and “the man who co-operates, for him, according to the cooperation, thus I care for him” (DNb 16–17; XPl 17–19) or “what a man achieves or brings according to his powers, by that I become satisfied, and it is very much my desire; and I am pleased and give generously to loyal man” (DNb 24–27; XPl 26–31).<sup>177</sup> This attitude is also described by Greek

<sup>169</sup> Jursa, “Höflinge.”

<sup>170</sup> In the summer of that year the rebellions against Xerxes started, upon which some retaliatory reprisals followed against a traditional Babylonian segment of the Babylonian elite. The pro-Persian Babylonians were not affected by these reprisals (see Caroline Waerzeggers, “The Babylonian Revolts against Xerxes and the ‘End of Archives,’” *Archiv für Orientforschung* 50 [2003/2004]: 150–73).

<sup>171</sup> Jursa, “Höflinge,” pp. 166–67.

<sup>172</sup> A good example is the *ša rēš šarri* engaged in managing functions in the ration distribution system in the palace archive from the time of Nebuchadnezzar II (Olof Pedersén, *Archive und Bibliotheken in Babylon: Die Tontafeln der Grabung Robert Koldeweys 1899–1917*, *Abhandlungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 25 [Saarbrücken: Saarländische Druckerei und Verlag, 2005], pp. 113–14; idem, “Foreign Professionals in Babylon: Evidence from the Archive in the Palace of Nebuchadnezzar II,” *Ethnicity in Ancient Mesopotamia* (papers read at the 48th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Leiden, 1–4 July 2002), edited by Wilfred H. van Soldt, *Publications de l'Institut historique et archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul* 102 [Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2005], p. 268; Jursa,

“Höflinge,” p. 163. This is easily comparable with the function of *Aspacānah-* in Persepolis.

<sup>173</sup> Jursa, “Höflinge,” pp. 169–70.

<sup>174</sup> A further indication for this may be that the title *ša rēš šarri* did not disappear completely after that date. Note that the title *ustarbaru* is not the only example of a Babylonian title being replaced by its Iranian equivalent. The same happened to *rab kāširi*, which was replaced by *ganzabaru* “treasurer.”

<sup>175</sup> “Collaborator” is not used here in its meaning of “someone who acts against his own people in favor of a foreign power,” but rather in a meaning “someone who helps run the affairs of a foreign power (e.g., the Persian empire) in a specific region (e.g., Mesopotamia).”

<sup>176</sup> Muhammad A. Dandamayev and Vladimir G. Lukonin, *The Culture and Social Institutions of Ancient Iran* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 138–39; Briant, *Histoire de l'empire perse*, pp. 314–66, esp. pp. 314–22 and 327–28.

<sup>177</sup> Translations by Rüdiger Schmitt, *The Bisitun Inscriptions of Darius the Great: Old Persian Text*, *Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum*, Part 1: *Inscriptions of Ancient Iran*, Vol. 1: *The Old Persian Inscriptions*, Texts 1 (London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1991), p.

authors: the king donates according to the cooperation and the gifts were abundant: gold or silver objects, garments, horses, weapons, cities, vast landholdings, etc. Important is also that apparently a register was kept of the people who were rewarded in this way.<sup>178</sup>

The people receiving such royal gifts were not necessarily Persians.<sup>179</sup> The Greek authors provide numerous examples of Greeks enjoying this honor: Demaratus, a Spartan king; Demokedes, the physician of Darius I; Pausanias, a Spartan general; etc. In some cases entire Greek communities (e.g., Akanthos and Abdera) were proclaimed “benefactor” and accordingly received gifts from the Persian king. Ešmun’azar II, the Phoenician ruler of Sidon (ca. 475 B.C.), received plots of land from the Persian king.

These foreigners served as the king’s strongholds in their respective homelands (Egypt, Babylonia, etc.) or as advisors in the relations of the Achaemenid empire with its neighbors (e.g., the Greeks). Through this system the king could have collaborators in each region of his empire.<sup>180</sup> The general idea is that while collaboration certainly goes hand-in-hand with basic imperial ruling structures, it was the Achaemenids who first institutionalized the registers of collaborators and gave them official status.

Greek authors described people receiving such royal gifts as “benefactors” (εὐεργέτης). According to Herodotus (8.85) they were called ὀροσάγγαι in Persian: οἱ δ’εὐεργέται βασιλέος ὀροσάγγαι καλέονται Περσιστί “The benefactors of the king are called *orosangae* in the Persian language.” The *Lexicon rhetoricum Cantabrigiense* (by Peter P. Dobree, 1822), which is based on a series of articles in the margin of a manuscript of Harpocration’s *Lexicon of the Ten Orators* (second century A.D.) mentions that Sophocles believed the ὀροσάγγαι to be bodyguards, whereas according to Nymphis of Heracleia (ca. 310–after 246 B.C.) the ὀροσάγγαι had “the highest precedence and were called royal guest-friends in their language” (τοὺς ὀροσάγγας ... παρὰ Πέρσαις τὴν μεγίστην ἔχειν προεδρίαν, καλεῖσθαι δὲ κατὰ γλῶτταν ξένους βασιλείους). In the lexicon of Hesychius (fifth century A.D.) one can read: ὀροσάγγης: σωματοφύλαξ, ἢ ὁ τὴν [sic] βασιλέως οἶκον πότε εὐεργετήσας “Bodyguard; or: he who has once been a benefactor to the royal house.” In his lexicon Photius simply calls them “the bodyguards of the king.”

An etymology for this word was proposed by R. Schmitt, who transformed Schaefer’s original etymology<sup>181</sup> into \**varusanha*- “widely reknown, world-famous” (Old Indian *urusāmsa*- “to be praised by many”). This hypothesis is now largely accepted.<sup>182</sup>

It is not entirely certain whether \**varusanha*- was the general Old Persian expression for the collaborators or an example of an Achaemenid aulic title. These titles form one of the many types of titles reflecting royal collaboration. In the Achaemenid empire many titles circulated that were not indications of real official functions, but which were rather honorary court titles. Nevertheless they were very important because they gave their bearers a great prestige, on the one hand, and easy access to more advanced positions, on the other hand. Some examples are ἀστάνδης “courier,” διφροφόρος “footstool-carrier,” δορυφόρος “lance-bearer,” \**gāθukabara*- (Elamite *ka<sub>4</sub>-du-ka<sub>4</sub>-bar-ra*) “chair-carrier,” μηλοφόρος “apple carrier,” οἶνοχόος “cup-bearer,” ὄπλοφόρος “squire,” \**patišvarnabara*- (Elamite *bat-ti-iš-mar-na-bar-ra-is*) “cup-bearer,” ῥαβδοφόρος “wand-bearer,” \**ṛštibara*- (Babylonian *āš-ta-bar-ri* and *āš-te-ba-ri-an-na*; Elamite *ir-iš-ti-bar-ra*, *ir-ti-bar-ra*, *iš-ti-ba-ra*, and *iš-ti-bar-ra*) “lance-bearer,” *φαρετροφόρος* “quiver-bearer,” etc.<sup>183</sup>

71 for DB; and idem, *The Old Persian Inscriptions of Naqsh-e Rostam and Persepolis*, *Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum*, Part 1: Inscriptions of Ancient Iran, Vol. 1: The Old Persian Inscriptions, Texts 2 (London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 2000), pp. 40 and 103 for DNB and XPL.

<sup>178</sup> Cf. Briant, *Histoire de l’empire perse*, pp. 303–04.

<sup>179</sup> Josef Wiesehöfer, “Die ‘Freunde’ und die ‘Wohltäter’ des Großkönigs,” *Studia Iranica* 9 (1980): 17–19, has a list of foreigners receiving those honors. See also Briant, *Histoire de l’empire perse*, pp. 359–64.

<sup>180</sup> Briant, *Histoire de l’empire perse*, p. 361.

<sup>181</sup> Old Persian \**varuθanha*- (Hans H. Schaefer, review of *Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten*, by Carl Schmidt and Hans Jakob Polotsky, *Gnomon* 9 [1933], 347 n. 3; Eilers, *Iranische Beamtennamen*, pp. 23–24 n. 4; Brandenstein and Mayrhofer, *Handbuch des Altpersischen*, p. 147). Already Jules Oppert, “Mémoire sur les inscriptions des achéménides conçues dans l’idiome des anciens Perses,” *Journal Asiatique* 4/17 (1851): 266, connected the ὀροσάγγαι with the Old Indian expression.

<sup>182</sup> Rüdiger Schmitt, “Medisches und persisches Sprachgut bei Herodot,” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 117 (1967): 131; Wiesehöfer, “Die ‘Freunde,’” p. 8; Dandamayev and Lukonin, *The Culture*, p. 138; Briant, *Histoire de l’empire perse*, p. 948; Angus M. Bowie, *Herodotus: Histories*, Book VIII, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 176–77;

Manfred Brust, *Die indischen und iranischen Lehnwörter im Griechischen*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 118 (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck, 2005), pp. 492–94; Joseph Wiesehöfer, “Günstlinge und Privilegien am Achämenidenhof,” in *Der Achämenidenhof*, edited by Bruno Jacobs and Robert Rollinger, *Classica et Orientalia* 2 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010), p. 515. Alternative and unlikely reconstructions are \**xursansa*- “worthy of being recorded, worthy of praise” (George Rawlinson, *The History of Herodotus* [New York: Appleton, 1859–1860], p. 275), \**varxšāyata*- “protecting the king” (Heinrich Stein, *Herodotus erklärt*, Vol. 5: *Buch VIII und IX*, *Namenverzeichnis* [Berlin: Weidmanns, 1868], p. 65; Reginald W. Macan, *Herodotus, the Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Books* [London: Macmillan, 1908], p. 492; Walter W. How and Joseph Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1912], pp. 264–65), \**hvarzanga*- “working well” (Brandenstein and Mayrhofer, *Handbuch des Altpersischen*, pp. 95–96), and \**rivivaθa*- “friend” (Gherardo Gnoli, *Ricerche storiche sul Sistān antico* [Rome: Istituto per il Medio e Estremo Oriente, 1967], p. 48 n. 2; Paul Bernard, “Une problème de toponymie antique dans l’Asie centrale: les noms anciens de Qandahar,” *Studia Iranica* 3 [1974]: 179–80 n. 126).

<sup>183</sup> Briant, *Histoire de l’empire perse*, pp. 124–25, 319–22, 642, and 791–92; Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” pp. 120–22.

The title *vačabara-* (*ustarbaru*, *lipte kuktir*) was in all likelihood also a court title. The characteristics which can generally be attributed to the court titles also apply to it. The *ustarbarus* were all of high rank (including possible connections to the royal house and/or gifts from the royal family) and had access to high offices, as is demonstrated above. The fact that *ustarbarus* combined their title with other office titles (cf. § 3.1) confirms this. In other words, the title *ustarbar* did not denote a real office, but was an honorary aulic title that opened professional possibilities for its owners.<sup>184</sup>

In addition, the Murašû archive especially documents lands that were used by the royal administration and its co-operators. This might be an explanation for the frequency of *ustarbarus* in this archive, as opposed to other archives. One should, however, not forget the influence of Darius II's struggle for the throne on the number of *ustarbarus* (see above).

This collaboration model is quite well known for the Achaemenid period. Our documentation for other periods is scanty. Yet glances of this model can be found in the Neo-Elamite texts: the estates mentioned in the inscription of Šuturu (EKI 74) may well be royal gifts. Hanni suggests that he was rewarded by King Šutur-Nahhunte, the son of Intata, because of his good deeds toward the king (EKI 75). The Susa Acropole texts mention some groups (e.g., the Samatians, the Zampekirian Persians) who lived in some alliance with the Neo-Elamite king. By bestowing these groups with gifts, the king buys their loyalty, while they could retain their semi-autonomous status. It is, however, not certain if in the latter case a system comparable with the Achaemenid collaboration model was at work, because the precise relations between the Neo-Elamite kingdom and these groups are not known.

Although the collaboration model as briefly described above probably existed in the Neo-Elamite kingdom, it seems that the titles *vačabara-* and *lipte kuktir* were only used during the Achaemenid period.

With all this in mind it is possible to assume that *vačabara-* (*ustarbaru*, *lipte kuktir*) was one of the aulic titles that could be granted to collaborators with the empire. This is not contradictory to the title *ὀροσάγγαι*, which was a general expression for the collaborators. That is, the appellative *vačabara-* was one of the aulic titles which could, as a gift, be granted to collaborators; all *ustarbarus* were *ὀροσάγγαι*, whereas only some *ὀροσάγγαι* had the title *ustarbaru*.

## 6. Conclusion

This article presents a closer look at the Babylonian appellative *ustarbaru*, which occurs in various texts from the Achaemenid period. The term *ustarbaru* is the Babylonian equivalent of Old Persian *vačabara-* and Elamite *lipte ku(k)tir*. In the Babylonian texts thirty-two individual *ustarbarus* are attested, whereas in Old Persian and Elamite texts only two individual *vačabara-* / *lipte ku(k)tir*, among whom is the most famous official, namely, Aspathines, occur. Interestingly, some guards of a royal tomb having this title appear in the Persepolis Fortification texts.

Etymologically Old Persian *vačabara-*, the source word, means “garment-bearer.” The Babylonian equivalent *ustarbaru* is simply a rendering of *\*vastrabara-*, the Median form of *vačabara-*. The Elamite equivalent, *lipte ku(k)tir*, is a literary translation of *vačabara-*, *lipte* meaning “garment” and *ku(k)tir* meaning “bearer.”

The garment-bearers, however, were not real garment-bearers. Their title was only one of the many Achaemenid court titles that were bestowed to persons, Persians as well as non-Persians, who in one way or another acted as collaborators with the Achaemenid administration and who were generally called *\*varusanha-* “widely reknown” in Old Persian. *\*Varusanha-* is clearly a more general expression; one may safely assume that all *vačabaras* were *\*varusanhas*, but not vice versa. It is unfortunately impossible to discern why these collaborators were granted one title or the other. Their title of *ustarbaru* had nothing to do with their activities as presented to us through the tablets. These activities were more accurately reflected in the other titles the *ustarbarus* had, although these titles are only rarely known to us.

In any case, the possession of court titles, including *vačabara-*, could open doors to higher positions within the Achaemenid administration. Accordingly, the owners of the title *vačabara-* had a high social status. They combined their *ustarbar*-status with other functions (e.g., royal chancellor, *karamaraš* or *šaknu*) and did most likely belong to the upper levels of Achaemenid society, since they owned extensive estates and had various subordinates whose task it was to manage the business of their master. They managed royal estates (e.g., the estate of Parysatis) or could have juridical power. In addition they had a close relationship with the royal family.

The title of *vačabara-* was not limited to Persians. The Greek classical authors mention non-Persians receiving this honor and in the Babylonian texts many *vačabaras* with non-Persian names appear.

The reason why these people were called “garment-bearers” is probably the garment they received when being granted the title. This garment was the exclusive symbol connected with this appellative. Unfortunately, there is no absolute certainty on this idea. In any case, many other offices had their own insignia, for example, axes.

<sup>184</sup> Henkelman, “An Elamite Memorial,” p. 128; Jursa, “Höflinge,” p. 168.

The oldest attestations come from the time of Darius I, but most *ustarbaru*s are attested in the reign of Darius II, who apparently granted this title to several of his supporters after his throne accession.

To sum up, the title *ustarbaru* was a prestigious title that was awarded to people because of special services they had delivered to the empire. When the title *ustarbar*, which was rarely used before the reign of Xerxes, became more widespread, possibly as a consequence of the further Iranization of the administration, it gradually took over the place of the title *ša rēš šarri*.

## Abbreviations

ADD	C. H. W. Johns, <i>Assyrian Deeds and Documents Recording the Transfer of Property, Including the So-called Private Contracts, Legal Decisions, and Proclamations, Preserved in the Kouyunjik Collections of the British Museum, Chiefly of the 7th Century B.C.</i> Cambridge: Deighton Bell, 1898–1923
AHw.	Wolfram von Soden, <i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i> . 3 volumes. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1965–1981
AIONS 77	Matthew W. Stolper, <i>Late Achaemenid, Early Macedonian and Early Seleucid Records of Deposit and Related Texts</i> . Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli, Supplemento 77. Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1993
Amherst	Theophilus G. Pinches, "Notes Upon a Small Collection of Tablets from the Birs Nimroud Belonging to Lord Amherst of Hackney." <i>Verhandlungen des XIII. Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses, Hamburg, September 1902</i> . Leiden: Brill, 1904
Anatolica 14	Francis Joannès, "Fragments de Nippur d'époque neo-babylonienne." <i>Anatolica</i> 14 (1987): 107–30
ATNS	J. B. Segal, <i>Aramaic Texts from North Saqqâra, with Some Fragments in Phoenician</i> . Excavations at North Saqqâra. Documentary Series 4, Texts from Excavations 6. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1983
BE 9	Hermann V. Hilprecht and Albert T. Clay, <i>Business Documents of Murashû Sons of Nippur, Dated in the Reign of Artaxerxes I (464–424 B.C.)</i> . The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, Series A: Cuneiform Texts 9. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Department of Archaeology and Palaeontology, 1898
BE 10	Albert T. Clay, <i>Business Documents of Murashû Sons of Nippur, Dated in the Reign of Darius II (424–404 B.C.)</i> . The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, Series A: Cuneiform Texts 10. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Department of Archaeology and Palaeontology, 1904
BM	tablets in the collections of the British Museum, London
CAD	A. Leo Oppenheim et al., editors, <i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> . Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1956–2010
CTN 3	Stephanie Dalley and J. Nicholas Postgate, <i>The Tablets from Fort Shalmaneser</i> . Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud 3. Oxford: British School of Archaeology in Iraq, 1984
Dem. Nb.	Erich Lüddeckens et al., <i>Demotisches Namenbuch</i> . Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert, 1960–
EE	Matthew W. Stolper, <i>Entrepreneurs and Empire: The Murašû Archive, the Murašû Firm, and Persian Rule in Babylonia</i> . Publications de l'Institut Historique-Archéologique Néerlandais de Stamboul 54. Leiden: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul, 1985
EKI	Friedrich Wilhelm König, <i>Die elamischen Königsinschriften</i> . Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft 16. Graz: Ernst Weidners, 1965
Fs Perrot	François Vallat, ed., <i>Contribution à l'histoire de l'Iran: mélanges offerts à Jean Perrot</i> . Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les civilisations, 1990
HSM	museum number Harvard Semitic Museum
IMT	Veysel Donbaz and Matthew W. Stolper, <i>Istanbul Murašû Texts</i> . Publications de l'Institut Historique-Archéologique Néerlandais de Stamboul 79. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul, 1997
JCS 53	Matthew W. Stolper, "Fifth Century Nippur: Texts of the Murašûs and from Their Surroundings." <i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i> 53 (2001): 83–132
MDP 9	Vincent Scheil, <i>Textes Élamites - Anzanites</i> 3. Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse 9. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1907
Nin. 5	Elamite letter found in Niniveh and published in F. H. Weissbach, "Susische Tontäfelchen." <i>Beiträge zur Assyriologie und Semitischen Sprachwissenschaft</i> 4 (1902): 168–201
OECT 10	Gilbert J. P. McEwan, <i>Late Babylonian Texts in the Ashmolean Museum</i> . Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts 10. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984
PBS 2/1	Albert T. Clay, <i>Business Documents of Murashû Sons of Nippur, Dated to the Reign of Darius II</i> . University of Pennsylvania Publications of the Babylonian Section 2, No. 1. Philadelphia: University Museum, 1912
PF	Persepolis Fortification tablet published in Richard T. Hallock, <i>Persepolis Fortification Tablets</i> . Oriental Institute Publications 92. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969
PFNN	unpublished Elamite tablets from the Persepolis Fortification, transliterated by Richard T. Hallock

- RA 86 Matthew W. Stolper, "The Murašû Texts from Susa." *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 86 (1992): 69–77
- RA 90 Francis Joannès and André Lemaire, "Contrats babyloniens d'époque achéménide du Bît-Abî Râm avec une épigraphe araméenne." *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 90 (1996): 41–60
- ROMCT 2 Gilbert J. P. McEwan, *The Late Babylonian Tablets in the Royal Ontario Museum*. Royal Ontario Museum Cuneiform Texts 2. Toronto: Royal Ontario Museum, 1982
- TCL 12 Georges Contenau, *Contrats Néo-Babyloniens I: de Téglath-phalasar III à Nabonide*. Textes cunéiformes, Musées du Louvre, Département des Antiquités Orientales 12. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1927
- TCL 13 Georges Contenau, *Contrats Néo-Babyloniens II: Achéménides et Séleucides*. Textes cunéiformes, Musées du Louvre, Département des Antiquités Orientales 13. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1929
- TuM 2/3 Julius Lewy, *Neubabylonische Rechts- und Verwaltungs-Texte*. Texte und Materialien der Frau Professor Hilprecht Collection of Babylonian Antiquities im Eigentum der Universität Jena 2/3. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1933
- VAT museum number Vorderasiatisches Museum, Berlin
- VS 3 Friedrich Delitzsch, *Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin* 3. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1907
- WZKM 97 Michael Jursa and Matthew W. Stolper, "From the Tattannu Archive Fragment." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 97 (2007): 243–81